

be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on National Security; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GREENE of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS AND POSTPONING VOTES ON AMENDMENTS DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3322, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 3322, pursuant to House Resolution 427, following disposition of the amendment offered by Representative WALKER or his designee and specified in House Resolution 427, the following amendments or germane modifications thereof be considered in the following order and notwithstanding their amending portions of the bill not yet read for amendment: An amendment offered by Representative SCHIFF regarding National Science Foundation funding; amendment No. 3 by Representative GEKAS; amendment No. 7 by Representative THORNBERRY; amendment No. 22 by Representative TRAFICANT; an amendment offered by Representative ROEMER regarding endocrine disruptors; an amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CRAMER; amendment No. 14 by Representative LOFGREN; and amendment No. 8 by Representative BROWN of California, following disposition of which committee shall resume consideration of the bill pursuant to House Resolution 427.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any of these amendments to the bill, or any amendments thereto. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first of any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COOLEY. Madam Speaker, on welfare reform Bill Clinton has performed one shameless flip-flop after the next. During the 1992 Presidential campaign, candidate Clinton promised to end welfare as we know it. President Clinton never offered any serious welfare reform program. There was never even a vote on welfare reform when the Democrats controlled the Congress during the first 2 years of his Presidency. Clinton on the record opposes the idea of allowing governments to pursue their own welfare programs, saying there is a danger that some States will get into a race to the bottom.

When the Republicans led the Congress, we kept our promise and sent Bill Clinton a bill that would genuinely reform welfare. We not only sent it to him once but we sent it to him twice, and he vetoed it both times. Madam Speaker, I think we need to look at welfare reform very seriously and offer the American people a new program that will truly, truly revise welfare.

#### BLOATED CONGRESSIONAL MILITARY BUDGET

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Madam Speaker, you would think that my Republican colleagues have learned their lesson. Over the past year, the American people have expressed their outrage over the 1996 congressional military budget which gave the Pentagon \$7 billion more than they asked for. Well, Madam Speaker, here we go again. This year the Republican led Congress has decided to give the Pentagon \$13 billion more than what it asked for. Maybe my Republican colleagues did not get the message. Why don't they use the extra \$13 billion on environmental programs which their 1997 budget cut by 19 percent. Or maybe they could use the money to provide student loans to the 2.5 million young people who will have their student loans reduced under the Republican budget.

Madam Speaker, we know that our military budget is much larger than the military budgets of all of our enemies combined.

So, since there is no country—or, even group of countries that poses a credible threat to our national security, on behalf of the American people I must ask if the real threat the Republicans fear is a foreign power, or the wrath of the defense industry.

#### OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 427 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3322.

□ 1425

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3322) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring before the House H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. This bill provides fiscal 1997 authorizations for the National Science Foundation, NASA, the U.S. Fire Administration in FEMA, NOAA, the research programs of EPA, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the research programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and the earthquake hazards reduction program. This legislation provides 5 percent or \$285 million more in basic research spending than the Clinton administration budget.

This chart to my left indicates the basic funding research and shows that we are higher in funding the fundamental science of the country than what the Clinton administration budget calls for.

In addition, this bill calls for \$3.7 billion for environmental science including \$1.25 billion for the global climate change programs, and it ends corporate welfare. In short, this represents a sound and responsible approach to the funding of our Nation's Federal civilian research and development efforts.

The legislation authorizes \$19.3 billion for fiscal year 1997. The President's request for these programs is \$20.3 billion.

We provide \$3.2 billion for the National Science Foundation, a \$31 million increase over fiscal year 1996, plus \$26 million for basic research grants and \$25 million for South Pole environmental and safety renovations.

We provide \$13.5 billion for NASA, including full funding for the space station, an increase in space science and life and microgravity research and \$1 billion for the missions to planet Earth.

We provide \$27.6 million for the U.S. fire administration. The President's request is that same number.

We provide \$1.37 billion for what are called the dry programs of NOAA, including full modernization of the National Weather Service, \$100 million for basic climate change research, and a complete project authorization for the

installation of the Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System, the new weather forecasting technology so crucial to public safety.

We provide \$490 million for EPA's Office of Research and Development.

We provide \$385.8 million for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$21 million over current funding and \$10 million more than the President's request for the core functions of that agency.

We provide \$186 billion for the research and development programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, its current funding level.

We provide \$95.2 million for Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program. That is the President's request.

We are considering this science authorization bill in the same coordinated manner as last year, whereby we combined our individual authorization bills into one vehicle, a process which enables us to consider civilian research and development in a broad, rational context. We do not include the Department of Energy's programs in this bill, since we have already passed fiscal 1997 authorization in last year's bill. The subcommittee of jurisdiction, however, may consider a more detailed specification of those numbers in the near future.

Along with providing funding, this bill includes some important policy provisions. In the NASA title, for instance, we have included language advancing the commercial use of the space station; making important amendments to the Commercial Space Launch Act; procurement changes to encourage the agency to use existing commercial technology in its programs, and to purchase private sector science and environmental data. Within NOAA, we revise the National Weather Service's Organic Act to allow the privatization of specialized weather services. And, at EPA, we have charged the Assistant Administrator for Research with responsibility for the quality of science at EPA, and we require the Science Advisory Board to review EPA's research budget.

We have made some tough choices in crafting this legislation, choices made in the context of what is likely to be contained in the budget resolution and in the context of moving us along the glide path which leads to a balanced budget. Why? Because the Committee on Science has decided to be relevant to the process. We realize that if we, as authorizers, are going to have an impact on the funding decisions that will be made in the appropriations process, we have to commit ourselves to a realistic plan. Believe me, as all of our committee members know, those choices have not always been popular and they surely have not been easy.

□ 1430

But I am proud of the work that we have done, and that good work is reflected in the fact that our bill passed the committee with bipartisan support.

The tenor of the policy debate has now changed within the Congress and the science community as the emphasis has shifted from industrial policy to basic research and from status quo subsidies to new knowledge. Quite simply, we have proven to our colleagues and to the science community that this committee is serious about its responsibility and it is up to the challenge of setting our priorities and is tough enough to effect real change.

At the conclusion of general debate, I will offer a manager's amendment to address the jurisdictional problems we have had with two other committees and to make some administrative changes at the request of the National Science Foundation. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. STEVE SCHIFF, will also have an amendment to add \$41.2 million to NSF's university research grants account to reflect the work of the Committee on the Budget to bolster basic research.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge for special thanks the cosponsors of the legislation, the Chairs of our subcommittee who have been a part of the team, and without whose help we could not have brought this bill to the floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. JIM SENSENBRENNER, the gentleman from California, Mr. DANA ROHRBACHER, the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. STEVE SCHIFF, and the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. CONNIE MORELLA.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I hardly know where to start with this bill. I am not sure whether I should discuss the policy proposals in this bill or the process by which this bill was put together. Maybe I should start with my deep regret that we have come to the floor today so deeply divided on support for Federal research and development [R&D] programs, issues that should elicit bipartisan support.

And I note the chairman indicated that there was bipartisan support for his bill. The rollcall will show that one Democrat, who probably did not know what he was voting, for, voted in support of this bill, and this does not exactly indicate to me strong bipartisan support.

But both because of the proposals being made and the process that was used in putting this bill together, I cannot support H.R. 3322.

My difficulties with this legislation start with the title: Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act. This is not an omnibus bill.

When the House considered H.R. 2405 last year, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was enthusiastic about his revolutionary idea to bring all of the Science Committee authorization bills into a single, omnibus bill. Among its

other virtues, he argued, was that it would permit Congress to consider priorities among the civilian science portfolio.

I was skeptical last year and I remain skeptical today. As I predicted last year, packaging the committee's bill together into a single bill has not expedited its consideration in the Senate. Indeed, last year's authorization bill remains languishing there without any Senate action on any of its provisions. This year's bill is likely to face the same fate.

Nor does the claim that packaging these bills together permits Congress to set priorities stand up to closer scrutiny. As I also pointed out last year, much of the civilian R&D science and technology portfolio is not in this committee's jurisdiction. For example, neither NIH nor USDA, which together constitute a very significant fraction of the total of civilian science budget, are included in this bill. And, as the Resources Committee and the Transportation Committee have reminded us, neither are some of the research programs in NOAA, the Department of the Interior, and the Federal Aviation Administration. So the fact is that we only have some of the civilian science portfolio in front of us. We can't trade off the space station for more AIDS research in this bill.

The case is even tougher to make this year because the so-called omnibus bill is less omnibus than last year's bill. The committee has, for political reasons, left behind programs, indeed entire Federal departments, that are under our jurisdiction and should be included in this bill. The Department of Energy's civilian research and development portfolio, a modest \$4.7 billion per year effort, has been dropped from this bill, reportedly due to differences within the ranks of the majority on our committee. Likewise, the external programs at the Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology have been left behind, for the second year in a row, for political reasons on the other side of the aisle.

Of course, the argument that we are setting priorities assumes that Members could actually offer amendments to move funding from one agency to another. But, under the rule which we are considering today, amendments which move funding from one title to another are subject to a point of order.

The idea that we are somehow setting priorities is one of the most absurd fictions that we will be hearing from the other side today. As we all know, the real task of setting priorities is done in the Appropriations Committee, where the 602(b) allocation forces hard choices among sometimes disparate programs. The bill today has little relevance to those decisions. It doesn't tell the HUD-VA-IA Subcommittee how to allocate funds between NASA and the housing program, or NSF and veteran's hospitals.

Once you get beyond the title, the substantive policy problems emerge.

Those programs that are contained in the legislation are treated so poorly and so arbitrarily that it would have been better to leave them out as well. This legislation cuts science programs so deeply that it is actually an antisience bill. It treats environmental and "soft path" energy research so badly that this is an antienvironment bill. H.R. 3322 makes major cuts and omissions to technology development programs, casting it as an antijobs and competitiveness bill. And by leaving DOE out all together, this is clearly a bill that is antienergy independence.

On science issues, the chairman has argued eloquently, if erroneously, that the Federal Government should be focusing on basic research and leave the rest of the work to the private sector. In this bill, the Republicans make large cuts to applied and developmental research work and then seek the gratitude of the scientific community for making smaller cuts to the basic science funded in this bill.

The Brown substitute to H.R. 3322 provides \$170 million greater support for basic research than the Republican proposal. But, in addition to total funds authorized, there are important differences from H.R. 3322 in the details of the allocations made and in the policies applied to the agencies.

The majority has expressed a preference for NASA space science through a more generous allocation than the substitute—so generous that the agency appears not to know what to do with the excess above its request. On the other hand, H.R. 3322 provides less than 1 percent growth for NSF, the premier basic research funding agency in the Science Committee's jurisdiction and the agency with the broadest charter for advancing research and education in science and engineering. The Brown substitute provides 3.3 percent growth for NSF, which will allow small growth above inflation, instead of the effective cut in the Republican bill, and this chart will show the differences in some of those areas.

H.R. 3322 also totally ignores a major component of the Federal civilian basic research funding by excluding authorizations for the Department of Energy. DOE has the largest basic research budget, after NSF, in the Science Committee's jurisdiction. This negligence is hardly consistent with the majority's claim to champion and protect basic research in the Federal R&D budget. The Brown substitute by contrast includes the President's request for DOE.

Further, unlike H.R. 3322, the substitute places no ban or restrictions on legitimate areas of scientific inquiry. The substitute presumes that the usual merit review process will be used by the agencies to select the most promising research directions to advance fundamental knowledge.

This distinction between basic and applied research is at the heart of the Republican proposal, and yet it is a dis-

tinction entirely without relevance the real world. I have worked at science policy for decades and cannot find the seam between basic and applied research. The reality is that ideas move along a continuum from the lab to the market and removing support to any one part of this process will stop progress.

What is more important in this bill is the overall funding level proposed. This bill, together with the DOE funding levels set during the debate on last year's omnibus bill, cuts fiscal year 1997 funding for the R&D programs under our jurisdiction \$1.3 billion below this year's funding levels and is \$2 billion under the President's request for fiscal year 1997. These cuts pose a grave threat to our civilian R&D activities. They are ill-advised and entirely unnecessary to achieve a balanced budget.

In contrast, the Republican bill essentially eliminates EPA's ability to fund research related to global climate change, an area often characterized by the Members on the other side of the aisle as "liberal claptrap." H.R. 3322 also continues an oblique attack on NSF's support for the behavioral and social sciences through elimination of an NSF scientific directorate and specific guidance to the agency in the accompanying legislative report.

Finally, the Brown substitute provides the resources needed to ensure NSF's ability to administer its research and education programs. H.R. 3322, on the other hand, imposes cuts of nearly 6 percent below the current year appropriation for NSF salaries and administrative expenses. Such a cut applied to a lean organization—only 6 percent of the total budget goes for running the agency—will result in staff reductions that could reach 10 percent of authorized strength. The net result would be to impede virtually all business operations of NSF from payments to scientists to the timing and quality of research award decisions.

As the green glow following Earth Day has faded, so has the Republican interest in the environment. The bill made major cuts to environmental programs when it was reported out of committee, cutting environmental R&D at the Environmental Protection Agency, the Mission to Planet Earth Program at NASA, and the oceanic and atmospheric programs at NOAA. The cuts to NOAA reported by the committee are particularly ironic, since they cut the coastal zone program by 80 percent the day after the House voted overwhelmingly to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Program as a manifestation of bipartisan concern for the environment. While these cuts, along with other damage to the NOAA programs, will be corrected by a manager's amendment to delete large sections of the bill to resolve the protests by the Resources Committee, the bill's antienvironmental slant remains evident in the remaining sections.

For example, the bill bans specific areas of environmental research. After arguing for science-based regulatory decision making in their regulatory reform efforts last year, the Republicans have tried to ban environmental research that they find troubling. Examples of this are the ban on indoor air quality at EPA contained in this bill, and the ban on funding for the climate change action plan efforts.

Continuing with the policy paradoxes found in this bill, I must raise again the

anticompetitiveness bent of this legislation. The private sector Council on Competitiveness just issued a study on a U.S. R&D policy for competitiveness that pointed out the need for joint industry-government research programs. Over the past few months, we have heard from a number of industrial leaders who have argued in favor of the joint technology development programs and manufacturing extension programs at NIST. Yet the Republicans have left these programs out of this bill.

Last year, the Technology Subcommittee of the Science Committee unanimously approved H.R. 1871, to authorize the external technology programs at NIST. That bill has never been taken up by the full committee. We have tried to offer this consensus legislation to the omnibus bill last year and again this year, but the Republicans have blocked our efforts. The omission of these technology development programs at NIST and cuts to applied and developmental R&D programs throughout this bill pose a great threat to our ability to compete in the world. While other countries are increasing their R&D, we are cutting ours. What is wrong with this picture?

One last major point to be made is the signal being sent by not offering a DOE title to this bill. Initially, a DOE R&D authorization was to be included in this bill, but a number of committee Republicans apparently thought that the cuts went too far. As a result, the DOE R&D provisions were pulled from the bill with vague promises that such a bill may be considered someday by the committee. But Members need not wait for the committee to act to see what those proposals were, because they were incorporated into the report accompanying the budget resolution. The report calls for a radical reduction in DOE's energy research programs, including a call to phase out DOE's R&D directed at solar and renewable energy technologies, new fossil energy technologies, and energy conservation measures. Many of the committee's Republicans have written to the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee disagreeing with these priorities, but we find nothing in H.R. 3322 to give Members the opportunity to vote on these radical proposals.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a few minutes discussing the procedural abuses in bringing this bill to the floor. The minority's dissenting views set out these concerns in some detail, and I will not repeat them all here. Suffice to say that no opportunity was missed to minimize the ability of Members to understand or challenge the bill. The legislative record is inadequate and nonexistent on many issues. Subcommittee markups were bypassed over the objections of the minority. No bill was introduced prior to markup, and Members first saw the chairman's mark on a Monday morning for a Wednesday morning markup, during a week in which no votes were scheduled until after 5 on Tuesday.

Instead of a reasonable, deliberative, and collegial process, the committee's markup was reduced to rubberstamping the chairman's proposal. The quality of the committee's work product has, in my view, suffered as a result.

Mr. Chairman, you don't need to take my word for this. I understand that the chairman of the Resources Committee, Mr. YOUNG, vehemently objected to numerous provisions in his committee's jurisdiction, none of which had been reviewed by his committee, stating

"there is no reason to have our Members precipitously consider another flawed and controversial measure." As a result, we now have a manager's amendment which will delete a number of pages from the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, one of the traditional prerogatives enjoyed by the minority is the right to complain about its treatment at the hands of the majority. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he served as this committee's ranking minority member, knew no peer in that regard. It is interesting now to see what sparked his complaints.

In 1992, Mr. WALKER complained bitterly about the process by which the then-Democratic majority brought one bill—H.R. 5231, the National Competitiveness Act of 1992—to the committee for a markup. In that case, the subcommittee held over 25 hearings and heard from over 100 expert witnesses. Copies of the bill had been sent to over 200 experts in the fields of science, technology, and trade for review and comment. On May 13, 1992, a draft of a bill was provided to the minority subcommittee staff, and to all members of the committee. The subcommittee chairman invited members to submit suggestions prior to the bill's introduction, and a number of members, including minority members, raised issues and concerns. The subcommittee met on June 24, 1992. At the subcommittee markup, the subcommittee ranking member, Mr. Tom Lewis, stated, "We have made considerable progress in working out our disagreements on the National Competitiveness Act of 1992, H.R. 5231, since it was introduced on May 21." While the subcommittee chair continued to express concerns and reserve final judgment on the bill, it was reported out of the subcommittee on a voice vote. The full committee met a week later, on July 1, 1992, and Mr. WALKER was given an opportunity to offer and debate a substitute amendment which clearly could have been objected to as non-germane. We debated this single bill on the floor for over 3 days.

Mr. Chairman, I know that our procedural complaints are often dismissed with the comment that the Republicans aren't doing anything that we didn't do to them when we were in the majority. I cannot speak for other committees and other former Chairs, but I will say that I tried to fully respect the rights and privileges of all members and the integrity of the committee process.

This self-serving statement aside, these squabbles tend to divert attention from the more serious issue at stake: the traditional role of expert committees. As political power has become concentrated in the hands of a few at the top of the Republican leadership, committees have become increasingly marginalized. Bills have been brought to the floor which have never been reported by the committees of jurisdiction. When bills have been reported, the House leadership has arbitrarily changed them to its liking before the bill comes to the floor. The committee structure is being replaced by webs of personal influence that binds Members to their leadership, and weaken the value of their individual votes.

The minority objects to these efforts to bypass the collective, considered judgment of committees through tactics that discourage members from obtaining information and participating in thoughtful discussion, negotiation, and compromise.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting against H.R. 3322.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from California, who is obviously opposed to this bill because this bill goes in a different direction than the ideology that has been promoted by this Congress now for 60 years.

For 60 years the science programs moved more and more toward Washington decisionmaking, toward more and more big spending that drove us into deficit budgets, toward more and more pork barrel, and then toward the end of the process, toward funding corporate welfare in this country and calling it science spending.

I understand that the gentleman's ideology forces him to stick with the status quo and not want to change anything in the direction that science has been going. This bill represents a real reform bill moving us in new directions, and the Democrats are determined to oppose those reforms and those new directions. But in the opinion of this Member, this is exactly the direction we have to go if we ultimately are going to balance our budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, within H.R. 3322, my Subcommittee on Basic Research has jurisdiction over three titles of this bill, title I, the National Science Foundation, title III, the U.S. Fire Administration, and title VIII, the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.

In the Basic Research Subcommittee, support for all three titles has traditionally been bipartisan. This is particularly true for the activities of the National Science Foundation.

The National Science Foundation [NSF] is the principal supporter of fundamental research and education conducted at colleges and universities in the fields of mathematics, science, and engineering.

NSF accomplishes this through grants and contracts to more than 2,000 colleges, universities, and other research institutions in all parts of the United States. The Foundation accounts for approximately 25 percent of the Federal support to academic institutions for basic research.

As chairman of this committee and vice chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. WALKER, has voiced his strong support for basic research. I share those same views. There are provisions in this bill requiring financial disclosure of high level employees, protecting Reservist and National Guard personnel recalled to active duty, and tasking NSF to find ways to reduce costs.

Title I authorizes \$3.25 billion for NSF in fiscal year 1997. Research and related activities is funded at \$2.34 billion. Unlike the administration's budget, which zeros out academic facilities modernization, H.R. 3322 provides \$100 million for this account. The bill also continues full funding for the Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory [LIGO] and provides \$25 million for the South Pole Safety project.

In this tight fiscal climate, the committee has had to set priorities for the future in R&D funding. Realizing this fact, H.R. 3322 freezes the salaries and expenses account at \$120 million. In an effort to reduce the bureaucracy and increase the focus on basic research, the bill directs NSF to eliminate at least one directorate. Further, H.R. 3322 requires that NSF review its programs and directorates to determine whether they are organized to meet the needs of their customer—the research community—into the 21st century.

The science community needs to understand that the Republican and Democrats in both the House and Senate, on both the Appropriations and Authorization Committees, have been supportive of basic research. Because Members understand that basic research is the economic foundation for our future, they have sheltered these programs when many others are being drastically reduced or eliminated altogether.

There are many good provisions in this bill. As I have stated previously, members of this committee on both sides of the aisle have traditionally been strong supporters of NSF. This is partially true because NSF administers research that is merit based on peer reviewed. Other agencies should endeavor to emulate this model of success.

Title III of H.R. 3322 authorizes \$27.6 million, the administration's request, for the U.S. Fire Administration [USFA] and the National Fire Academy. This relatively small amount of money goes quite a distance toward protecting both people and property from the devastating effects of fire and arson, particularly, I might add at this tragic time in the Southeast, where I live.

The Fire Administration was created over 20 years ago in response to an increasing number of fire-related deaths and injuries in this country. The programs, at the Fire Administration help to reduce loss of life and property to fires by educating the public, collecting and distributing data, conducting research into fire suppression technologies and techniques, and promoting firefighter health and safety. Since the Fire Administration was established, fire-related deaths have decreased from 9,000 per year to 4,300 per year; fire-related injuries have decreased from 300,000 per year to 27,000 per year; and firefighter deaths have decreased from 250 per year to 100 per year. This agency clearly deserves commendation for its success.

In addition, the Fire Administers the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, MD. The Fire Academy is lauded by firefighters nationwide for the fire and emergency training it provides. Each year tens of thousands of firefighters and emergency service personnel are trained in the latest fire protection and control activities through both on- and off-campus programs.

Over the past couple of months, in my home State of New Mexico, wild fires have been burning out of control because of dry weather conditions. Lives, property, and precious national monuments are threatened. The hundreds of firefighters who are out on the front lines, risking their lives, need the continuing support of an agency that helps them to do their jobs more safely.

Finally, title VIII of H.R. 3322 reauthorizes the earthquake research, education, and mitigation programs of the Federal Government. Specifically, the bill provides \$95.3 million for the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction program [NEHRP] for fiscal year 1997.

NEHRP was established in 1977 in response to the catastrophic loss of life and property suffered during earthquakes, and to a growing consensus that a Federal research and development program might lead to a method for predicting an earthquake and/or at least reducing the devastating effects of one. While prediction has remained somewhat elusive, the program has greatly improved our knowledge of both the earth science and engineering aspects of earthquake risk reduction.

NEHRP is administered by four Federal agencies, the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the U.S. Geological Survey [USGS], the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST]. FEMA is the agency charged with coordinating the program, and, in addition, is responsible for public education, earthquake hazards mitigation programs, emergency planning, and information gathering and dissemination. The USGS conducts research on earthquake risk and effect. The NSF performs fundamental earthquake studies, engineering research, and postearthquake investigations. NIST conducts applied engineering research and code development and distribution.

Each of the NEHRP agencies has separate budgets. The funds in this title for NSF and NIST are from sums already authorized in previous titles for the two agencies.

The \$95.3 million authorized for NEHRP in this legislation is what the administration requested for fiscal year 1997.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude my opening presentation to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], our chairman, for bringing this bill to the floor. In my experience in 7½ years in having the privilege of

serving in the House of Representatives, with several noted exceptions, I have seen authorizing committees being diminished in their real role in the U.S. House of Representatives. I believe that is because the authorizing committee have tried to avoid making the tough decisions that the Committee on Appropriations must always make.

It is easier to authorize everything which in reality means authorizing nothing. Under Chairman WALKER we are presenting a plan, a plan that can be and will be debated on the House floor but a plan that shows the Committee on Science is committed to promoting priorities in science and research development.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the merits of H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization for 1996, one large portion of the bill is noticeably absent. Members interested in the authorization levels for the Department of Energy's programs will not find a title authorizing those programs in this legislation.

Although programs relating to conservation, renewable energy sources and fossil energy are of obvious importance to the Nation, they will not be considered as a part of this omnibus bill.

Under the language of the omnibus science bill considered during the last budget cycle, the authorizations for DOE programs for this fiscal year were included. This was accomplished through an amendment offered by Chairman WALKER and agreed to by the full House by a voice vote.

It is unfortunate that the House will not have the opportunity to set policy guidelines for the Department of Energy through this bill. A separate bill dealing with DOE is scheduled for subcommittee considerations, but I suspect that the full committee will never see the legislation, nor will the House as a whole. I find this process objectionable.

With regard to the language of the bill that is before us, I will be supporting an amendment offered by Mr. TANNER and myself to provide authorization to the Advanced Technology Program and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. These programs, which assist American companies in bringing new technologies to the marketplace, are critical for our economic development.

Although the Science Committee leadership has been opposed to these programs in the past, calling them corporate welfare, the appropriators, and the Senate, have seen fit to fund both the ATP and the MEP. Many on the Republican side of the aisle have expressed their support for these programs, as a fine example of government-industry partnerships which help America stay competitive.

Our overseas competitors have been continuing their investment in new technology, while America has moved away from this critical part of our economy. Large corporations which must constantly please stockholders are preoccupied with the bottom line, and are slow to invest in high-risk technology which can often have long-term rewards.

Small businesses often do not have the necessary capital to invest in high-risk technologies. The ATP and the MEP are programs which assist both large and small companies with high-risk investment.

The ATP, for example, is a program which has assisted many small businesses with new technology. Forty-six percent of ATP awards have gone to small businesses, or to joint ventures led by a small business.

Public-private partnerships are a viable and effective way to keep America competitive in the global economy, and our support of the ATP and MEP is one way for this Congress to assist American business in the global marketplace. I urge my colleagues to think carefully about this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentlewoman from Texas has mentioned again, as the chairman or as the Member from California did, the lack of an energy authorization in this particular bill.

I would refer both Members to H.R. 2405, the blue engrossed version of the bill that passed the House last year which we have already sent to the Senate, for fiscal year 1997 numbers for the Department of Energy. If they will refer to page 93, lines 6 through 17, they will find that we have already done our work in that regard and the reason why it did not need to be included here.

Mr. Chairman, as I made mention before, there may be a more detailed version of this to come out of the subcommittee at some later date, but the fact is the work of this committee has been completed, unlike past years when they were in control, when we hardly ever got anything done in that area.

The Advanced Technology Program to which the gentlewoman referred is one of the largest corporate welfare programs that this Nation has ever created. Some of the biggest corporations in America have benefited from the taxpayers' largesse through that program. It is a definition of what the American people want to change. It is one of the true reforms in this bill that we have decided not to go ahead with that program and use corporate welfare as a way of what we call science spending.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, it is easy to say you're in favor of balancing the budget. Congress has been saying it for years. But, until recently, those of us who are willing to

follow the words with actions have not had enough votes to bring the budget under control. Now, we do. Actions speak louder than words, and this body has proven it. We made the tough choices and passed a balanced budget resolution, only to be confronted with an administration that wants to put those choices off and some colleagues who say they want to balance the budget as long as they don't have to cut any programs.

The majority of us still have responsibility for putting the Government on a path to fiscal responsibility. We still have to make those hard calls. In the area of civil science, H.R. 3322 does that. In our civil space program, this bill represents a savings of \$308.7 million dollars from the President's request. It preserves and strengthens NASA's historic focus and contributions in basic science areas, such as astronomy, astrophysics, aerodynamics, life, and microgravity sciences. It reduces those programs which amount to commercial welfare, and restructures programs, such as Mission to Planet Earth, that bust the President's own NASA budget in the outyears. The administration abdicated its responsibility to maintain programs consistent with available resources when he sent two sets of books up here last month. He left the tough choices for Congress to make. We made them.

The bill fully funds the international space station and the space shuttle. The House passed a multiyear authorization of the station last year to put this program on a sound financial footing consistent with the balanced budget resolution. H.R. 3322 reaffirms the sound fiscal decisions we made last year. It also includes full funding for life and microgravity research, much of which will take place on the station and shuttle. This area of research is important in improving life on earth through new knowledge of materials and human physiology.

H.R. 3322 increases the funding for space science. This area of NASA basic research has brought us amazing discoveries from programs such as the Hubble space telescope and the Galileo probe to Jupiter. This increase preserves space science as the bipartisan priority it has always been for the Science Committee and protects it from the disproportionate cuts inflicted by the administration's outyear budget. Most of the increases are dedicated to small, focused science missions that stimulate education and drive costs down. The space science community has made the greatest strides in increasing the bang taxpayers receive for their buck by redesigning missions to be faster, cheaper, better. We need to reward success and ensure that space science does not suffer disproportionately in the President's budget. This bill does that.

The bill reduces the President's request for Mission to Planet Earth by \$373.7 million, but still provides over a billion dollars and fully funds the AM-

1, Landsat-7, and TRMM satellites; earth probes; and Mission to Planet Earth science, which alone accounts for \$508 million. In 1992 the Science Committee concluded that Mission to Planet Earth was not a core NASA mission. Therefore, the Science Committee treated it as a discretionary program to be funded with whatever funds remained after NASA's core programs were funded. In NASA's fiscal year 1994 authorization, the Science Committee reaffirmed Mission to Planet Earth's status as a "level of effort program that accomplishes as much as possible with whatever resources can be provided." Since the NASA budget is coming down, so must this discretionary program.

This year and last, several congressional witness testified that Mission to Planet Earth can be done at a lower cost by using new technology, exploiting commercial investments in earth observation, and leveraging existing environmental data bases which remain largely unanalyzed by scientists. The bill directs NASA to begin taking those steps that will shift the focus on Mission to Planet Earth to science instead of hardware.

We provide full funding for basic research efforts in aeronautics but control the rate of increase in the Advanced Subsonic Technology Program to prevent it from mutating into corporate welfare. H.R. 3322 saves \$34 million from the President's request for this program within the aeronautics budget.

We fully fund the new technology programs that are vital in taking our civil space program into the next century. These include new millennium spacecraft technology and the reusable launch vehicle. These programs will lower the cost of future government civil and national security space activities. They will also provide a boost to our commercial space industry as we transfer this technology into the private sector, making it more competitive with foreign space industries which receive huge, direct, operating subsidies from their governments.

Balancing the budget means making cuts and setting priorities, which we've done. H.R. 3322 builds on NASA's strengths and experience in basic research and fundamental science. It provides more than a billion dollars for studying this planet and the resources needed to bring the aviation industry into the next century. More importantly, it will continue NASA's accomplishments in revealing the wonders of the universe and set the stage for the future of human development of space. By passing H.R. 3322, we will enable NASA to continue achieving breakthroughs in science and keep the Government on the path toward balancing the budget.

□ 1500

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, and I hope this will be the last time I do it.

If I take 1 minute to clarify everything the other side said, it would be using up too much of my time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] cited the fact that we had an energy authorization bill from last year as the reason for not having it in this year's bill. Actually, we had an authorization for NSF in last year's bill, but we also have one in this year's bill. It is a little distinguishing on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to use the argument with regard to energy that we had an authorization last year, when he did not mention that for the NSF.

What has occurred, of course, is that the Department of Energy has a number of items in it which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] does not like and which he calls corporate welfare or liberal claptrap. All research is divided into three parts in his mind: basic research, which is good; and corporate welfare; and liberal claptrap, which he seeks to avoid.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], a member of one of our subcommittees.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the direction H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996, will take this Nation. It purports to support basic science and end corporate welfare, but I believe the policies advocated by the bill look to the past rather than to the future.

The bill would kill programs that support small business and create good, high-paying jobs in this worldwide economy. First, it eliminates the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program. MEP centers, as they are known in 42 States, assist small- and medium-size firms employing fewer than 500 workers to modernize in order to compete in the demanding global marketplace in the 1990's and beyond. This program has strong support of the business community, State and local governments, and the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about big, multinational corporations. There are 381,000 small manufacturers who are struggling to maintain their competitiveness. Their competitors are just as likely to be companies in Asia or Europe as another company down the street. The MEP is a highly successful program for small business and this Nation.

Second, the chairman of the committee wants to terminate the Advanced Technology Program. Although large corporations do participate in this program, approximately half of the ATP awards have gone to small businesses. Not only businesses participate in this program, but more than 100 universities are working on 157 ATP projects.

This type of industry-government-university partnership is what non-biased outside experts are recommending as the trend for the future. As



Brian Rushton, president of the American Chemical Society, stated:

The National Institute of Standards and Technology's Advanced Technology Program is a vital component of our nation's technology competitiveness portfolio. ACS strongly urges Congress to continue to support ATP. ATP supports market incentives and encourages companies to invest for the long-term in high-risk, high-payoff technologies.

Mr. Chairman, not alone in their view is the Council on Competitiveness. In its publication "Endless Frontier, Limited Resources," it concluded as its central finding that R&D partnerships hold the key to meeting the challenge of transition our Nation now faces. Eliminating the ATM and the MEP program is not eliminating corporate welfare, it is just eliminating a commonsense approach to a comprehensive research policy.

Although H.R. 3322 is supposed to be a comprehensive authorization for all civilian research and development science programs, it does not authorize the Department of Energy research. We have been told that we did that last year. They claim to have protected basic research; however, the DOE cuts in this bill damage all types of research. In Tennessee alone, the cuts to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the University of Tennessee, such programs as energy conservation and the things that enable our companies to compete, will be cut another 13 percent in addition to what was done last year for a total of 45 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I am as serious about deficit reduction as any Member of Congress. As a member of the coalition, I worked hard with them to develop a plan balancing our budget in 7 years. Everyone says it does. But we look at these policies in this bill, and it reminds me of 1950 rather than the year 2000.

Finally, quoting from the Council on Competitiveness again, it said: Equally the report finds the United States has an urgent interest in resolving the polarized debate over the proper role, Federal role in research and development. Battles over the proper limits of Government activity have reinforced the outdated distinction between basic and applied research as the primary basis for decision making.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California, Mr. BROWN, the ranking member, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, unfortunately, in opposition to the committee's bill. I have several concerns about this bill. One of those concerns I will raise in an amendment that I and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will offer

when we get to the NOAA section of the bill.

The National Weather Service is undergoing a major modernization and will be closing offices all over the country. While I and other Members support that modernization, I do not want some Government bureaucrat determining that my weather service office will be closed. I want more protection than that, and I and other Members of Congress have fought very hard to make sure that we have that kind of protection, and we have been denied that so far.

Mr. Chairman, currently a process exists in law to require the Secretary of Commerce to certify that such weather services will not be degraded. The committee's bill eliminates this requirement and, consequently, the committee's bill would allow weather service bureaucrats to close offices all over the country. Just this past weekend, my district there in Alabama suffered again from tornadoes, tornado warnings. Other sections of the country did, as well. Our section of the country was left out of the Weather Service's modernization plan, and we dotted i's, crossed t's, and now we are expected to be included in that modernization plan.

However, I do not want, in the process of getting our NEXRAD radar up and in place, I do not want a bureaucrat determining that for some even temporary length of time that we will be without that kind of coverage.

Mr. Chairman, another concern is that the committee's bill drastically cuts the operations budget for the Weather Service. That budget line cuts pay for the salaries of Weather Service employees in field offices across the Nation. The concern with that salary cut would be that it would eliminate midnight forecast shifts at all Weather Service offices. We simply cannot pay that kind of price, and we cannot go that far with this kind of funding. This bill would be devastating for other districts across the country.

Mr. Chairman, another issue that I am concerned about within the bill itself would be NASA's issues. The bill cuts NASA's salaries by \$81.5 million. NASA has been downsized enough. This is not the time to cut additional salaries.

Support the Brown substitute.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee on Science, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues of the Committee on Science in commending our Chairman, Mr. WALKER, for the very fine work that has gone into the preparation of this legislation for floor action.

Chairman WALKER has consistently supported the concept of unifying the civilian science missions of the Federal

Government under one policy umbrella, with the objective being greater consistency in the development and implementation of the research and development policies and activities of the Federal Government. Perhaps, one day, the Congress will take such a bold step as part of the effort to Re-engineer Government and make it more responsive to the needs of America in the 21st century.

But that day is not yet, and our chairman has worked faithfully to do the next best thing: Conduct an authorization process that genuinely looks at the budgetary constraints that we are faced with as we move toward ending annual operating deficits over a period of 7 years, and make reasoned judgments about our priorities for the national science programs taken as a whole.

In this way, we hope to use the monies available to us in the wisest way possible to expand the frontiers of knowledge and better our quality of life.

The bill before the House provides strong support for our basic research programs: Fully funding the core laboratory programs of the National Institutes of Standards and Technology is just one feature of that support. I have worked closely with our chairman in the structuring of those provisions of the bill, as well as others, and I can vouch for his good faith and diligence in striving to work cooperatively with all members of the committee to develop a bill which is balanced: Acceptable on the one hand to all who are concerned about continuing strong support for the basic research activities of the Federal science establishment, while on the other hand, responsive to the rightful concerns of those Members who are determined that this Congress meet its obligations of fiscal responsibility to future generations.

Of course, there are programs that I would like to see provided for in this legislation that do not presently appear, and I hope to work with the Chairman on amendments that might be found acceptable that would provide authorization for those programs, or increase funding for others which are authorized. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, located within the NIST umbrella at Commerce, and enhanced funding for environmental research are two areas of particular concern to me. At the same time, I am cognizant of the great responsibility we have to manage our resources wisely for the benefit of all citizens.

I believe that one of the oversight efforts which our committee could profitably undertake during the balance of this year would be to systematically explore the means through which priorities are set by individual agencies and recipients of national science research funds, and how well our research priorities match the technological, environmental, and health challenges that will

face us in the next century. I look forward to working with our chairman in that effort.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is 35 years ago this month, May 5, 1961, that a young man named Alan Shepard became the first American to fly into space. His 15-minute suborbital flight was the first milestone in a journey that has taken Americans to the moon, has led to the development of the world's first reusable spaceship, the space shuttle, and will soon result in American scientists and engineers conducting important research on the international space station.

□ 1515

Our citizens take great pride in what our Nation has achieved in the human space flight, and we look forward to what lies ahead.

We have some concerns, of course, about what lies ahead. The U.S. space program is not just about men and women in space.

I think ever since the dawn of the space age the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been pushing back the boundaries of knowledge and sending robotic spacecraft to almost every planet in the solar system, observing other stars and galaxies with space-based observatories and probing the very complexities of our own planet's atmosphere, our oceans, and our climate.

I think all of these achievements have been very impressive, but NASA's world class capabilities did not just come out of thin air, they are the result of investments by the American people, and that is why I am troubled a little bit about the bill the Members have before us today.

H.R. 3322 represents, in my opinion, a step backward in our support of the space program that has delivered so many benefits to our citizens.

I think most of my colleagues know that I consider myself somewhat of a fiscal conservative who is willing to make some tough spending cuts when we have to. In past years, though, I have worked with the chairman and with the ranking Democrat to make these cuts and to streamline the program, and NASA has risen to that challenge.

It had an outyear funding plan cut by over one-third over the last 4 years. No one else that I know of has made those type cuts.

I could give you examples, but time does not allow me to.

I would just say that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will offer an amendment to fix the programs in the NASA authorization that I have outlined, and I think that the American space program is very vital to our future. We ought to give it the re-

sources it needs to carry out the mission.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL]. This bill does not serve the space program well, and I therefore rise in strong opposition to this science bill.

Here we are once again fighting dramatic and excessive cuts in important programs, cuts that will, I think, be flawed and misguided if we adopt them.

The bill includes a \$374 million reduction for NASA's Mission to Planet Earth.

This equates to a 27-percent cut to the Earth observing system, the centerpiece of Mission to Planet Earth and NASA's contribution to the global effort to understand the Earth's climate. The science bill is a meat cleaver approach, in my opinion, and if Mission to Planet Earth is to remain viable, it cannot sustain these types of dramatic cuts.

Mission to Planet Earth is an evolving program, and these cuts would be devastating. We should not walk away from our national commitment to a better understanding of our environment.

This program is part of a substantial international effort. These cuts dramatically reduce our role in this cooperative structure and send the wrong message to our partners overseas. This should not be a partisan issue. President's Reagan and Bush both supported the program, and President Clinton counts Mission to Planet Earth as one of his top science priorities. Moreover, the scientific community has continued to validate the integrity of the program.

Therefore, as I said, we should not walk away from our commitment to Mission to Planet Earth for it is our investment today that will reap innumerable and long lasting benefits for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker from Texas indicated that this had been a bipartisan effort in the past. It ought to be a bipartisan issue in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the bill and support of the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from California and thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, despite my strong opposition to this bill, I would be remiss as the cochair of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, if I did not say that I am pleased the bill authorizes funds for the academy, equal to the President's request. This is a worthwhile investment in our Nation's fire safety and emergency medical activities. It provides the American people with the finest public education in fire prevention and control.

Again, I want to reiterate my strong opposition to the Civilian Science Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997. I believe the bill unfairly targets the Mission to Planet Earth Program. I

want to express my strong disappointment with the committee's decision to reduce funding for this important scientific program which is crucial to a better understanding of the world in which we all live.

The bill includes a \$374 million cut for NASA's Mission to Planet Earth. This equates to a 27-percent cut to the Earth Observing System [EOS], which is the centerpiece of NASA's contribution to the global effort to the understand how the Earth's climate works.

In 1990, President Bush, building upon the recommendations of the Reagan administration, recognized the importance of understanding the Earth's climate when he established the U.S. Global Change Research Program [USGCRP]. This program serves as our country's contribution to an international effort to develop the first integrated understanding of the Earth's processes and their effect on global climate change using remotely sensed and surface based data.

The cuts adopted by the Science Committee unfairly target three components of EOS and will put our country in a position of being unable to obtain and maintain our international contribution to this vital program. The bill would essentially eliminate the EOS-PM spacecraft, EOS CHEM spacecraft, and lessen the capability of the EOS data information system. These three programs are critical to the viability of the program.

The EOS-PM spacecraft is designed to enable fundamental advances in understanding the processes that govern weather and other climate phenomena. Over half of the critical measurements planned for all of EOS are included as part of this spacecraft. According to Dr. John Christy and Dr. Richard McNider of the Earth system laboratory at the University of Alabama, natural variations in the world's climate are real and have significant economic impact. Our current knowledge of the Earth's climate system is terribly inadequate. The Nation's present global change program is an appropriate place to begin to understand the Earth's climate system.

The EOS-CHEM spacecraft will improve our understanding of pollution and the ozone processes. This is critical at a time when increasing amounts of global pollution are coming from nations other than the United States with profound regional and global effects. It is important that we have a better understanding of how and why this occurs, so we can do what is necessary to get this situation under control.

The EOS data information system provides the means for controlling the satellites, processing data from the satellites into a usable form, storing and distributing that data to researchers and other users, and enabling data analysis. EOSDIS is the means by which NASA will transmit useful information to a variety of users. The program is currently on schedule and set to become operational in 1997. A 50-percent cut to this program would be devastating. A reduction of this magnitude will hinder our ability to control the orbits of the EOS satellites, schedule and maintain measurements of the instruments, and process store, and distribute the data. The benefits of the EOSDIS systems are enormous. It will establish for the first time an integrated, on-line, electronic library of geography based telemetry, synthetic aperture radar, and Landsat imagery. Moreover, NASA estimates that in addition to supporting Mission to Planet Earth scientists, EOSDIS will be used by thousands



of other scientists around the world, other researchers, and government officials. In addition, as the program continues to develop, it will eventually serve many commercial purposes.

In 1991, the EOS Program had an estimated 15-year budget of \$18 billion. In just 5 years, the program has been significantly reduced and is now a \$7 billion program. These decreases have resulted in fewer instruments, fewer measurements, and the elimination of vital areas of scientific research. NASA has shown its ability to cut the program over 60 percent without compromising the integrity and future of the program. NASA has also indicated a willingness to further reduce the costs of the program by incorporating new technology and strengthening partnerships with commercial, agency, and international partners.

In addition to the cuts in Mission to Planet Earth, the bill undermines the ability of NASA to carry out its functions by reducing the level of funding for salaries and expenses. The cut of \$81.5 million is not well thought out and will have devastating impact on all NASA centers. The net result will be either a NASA reduction in force totaling 1,400 employees by October 1, 1996 or an agencywide furlough for 12 to 14 days. This is unacceptable for one of the world's premiere science and technologically advanced institutions. NASA is already reducing its staff level to meet its zero based review. The levels they have achieved allow them to adequately meet the daily requirements necessary to efficiently carry out their operations. This is an unwise decision and it ought to be rejected.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and to support the Brown substitute which is a better investment for our country and which will allow these important scientific programs to meet their mission.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

I want to commend Chairman WALKER and the subcommittee chairs for reporting out a balanced bill that is supportive of science.

In this time of budget cutting, the Science Committee has worked hard to protect scientific research from undue hardship and to set priorities. I particularly want to thank Mr. SCHIFF for his amendment which will increase funding for the National Science Foundation by an additional \$41 million. I should add that I hope some of that money would be put to use ensuring that the Nation is served by an adequate number of supercomputer centers.

I am also pleased to see that the bill funds environmental research at healthy levels.

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with every policy decision that is embodied in this bill. But overall, the bill has accomplished exactly what the Science Committee has committed itself to do: it protects basic research, the foundation of our Nation's future success.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to join my colleagues

on the Committee on Science in bringing this well-constructed legislation to the House floor. The authorizations for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the EPA's Office of Research and Development will, as they did last year, fund all the vital research services of these important agencies and all the research they need to get their job done. At the same time we get budget savings by eliminating bureaucracy, by continuing privatization efforts endorsed by the administration and by eliminating earmarks that even the Clinton administration does not want.

Title IV of this bill will give the National Weather Service Forecast, for example, an increase of almost \$20 million from current funding to a total of \$626 million. So for those who are criticizing that we have cut the National Weather Service, let us note that there has been an actual increase in funding. This represents full support for the Weather Service modernization program and allows for full funding for the installation and operation of the state-of-the-art Doppler radars.

Title IV also authorizes completion of the computer software integration system known as AWIPS at a level the NOAA Administrator stated is sufficient to finish this pivotal component of the Weather Service modernization program.

Title IV also provides level funding of both long-term climate research and seasonal interannual climate research.

The Committee on Science has supported and will continue to support objective scientific research to improve our knowledge of weather phenomena such as El Niño.

What we will not support are programs such as that in the EPA which assumes an apocalyptic global warming and then spend enormous sums on studies that will prove or disprove what the impact of this global warming will have on the planet.

In title V of this bill, however, we do continue to support increased funding for research which supports the EPA's regulatory mission. Title V increases funding for research above the President's request for priority programs such as hazardous waste research, drinking water disinfection and air pollution caused by particulate matter. We stick to our balanced budget by eliminating corporate welfare programs such as the environmental technology initiative, research on indoor air which the EPA does not regulate, by the way, and climate programs which are legitimate climate programs rather than trendy scientific programs.

Mr. Chairman, before my time is up I would just like to say a few things about the NASA title of this bill. I would like to commend the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] as well as my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for the excellent product they have done.

Of course, one of my chief concerns in this area is that we fully utilize America's potential in the future in space by making sure that we do the development of the reusable launch system today that will be used tomorrow.

I have two concerns about the reusable launch program; first, we have never made an experimental flight test in this program based on only one vehicle, and the reusable launch vehicle program does not have enough money for a second copy for the X-33, and I would hope that we could do that, but obviously we are dealing with scarce funds and we have to set priorities.

So I am not happy with that, and I would like to see that corrected, but I recognize that we are operating on the budget where we are looking for a balanced budget in the end. Second, from time to time there have been bureaucratic attacks on the X-33 project basically because we are not doing things the way we used to do them. But the reusable launch vehicle program is so important to our future because it will do what is absolutely necessary if we are to have a space program in the future, and that is to bring down the cost of getting into space. Once we do that, then we can have all kinds of other programs in space and accomplish all kinds of other goals in space because we will have brought down the fundamental cost of getting into space in the first place.

So I am very happy that we have supported the X-33 program, which is the reusable launch vehicle program, in this bill. I would hope it would be a little stronger, but we are operating in a balanced budget concept here.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3322 is a fiscally sound bill, and I submit it is also a scientifically sound bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for science and a balanced budget. We are not exempting ourselves on the Committee on Science from making tough decisions and setting priorities in order to make sure that future generations will have their own money to spend rather than having us spend all of their science and research money now.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, as I rise today to talk about H.R. 3322, the purported Committee on Science bill, I am reminded of a slogan that came out of the presidential campaigns in the 1980s; it was, "Where is the beef?" Well, in this bill it is where is the energy? Where is the renewables? Where is the solar? Where is the environmental aspect in this bill?

Bringing this bill to the House floor without some of the most important components is like bringing the defense bill to the House floor without the Air Force components, or the education bill to the House floor without student loans, or the agriculture bill to the House floor without the dairy components.

Now why is that? Why are we not allowed to have out say on the energy? It is a good question.

We had a markup scheduled for May 15, and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], and I, who worked together on offsets and on balancing the budget and trying to come up with cuts in programs, we were dissuaded or not allowed to have that committee markup, and I come here, Mr. Chairman, to do the people's business.

Now, we may not win on our amendments in a subcommittee markup to go to the full committee, but we should have our opportunity and our say-so in the democratic process to get our markup together after months of hearings and to have our input as the experts in the subcommittee to make recommendations to the full committee on renewables and energy concerns. We were not allowed to do that.

Why? Maybe because last year's bill had a 50-percent cut to solar R&D, a 30-percent cut to renewable R&D, a 20-percent cut to fusion R&D, and a 10-percent cut to biological and environmental research. It is no wonder that these very important programs are conspicuously absent from this bill.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think when we begin to talk about science and the twenty-first century, all of us would like to come to the House floor and really propose the support of H.R. 3322 in a bipartisan manner.

This disappoints me greatly that I have to rise and vehemently disagree with this legislative primarily because I am a strong proponent of science being the work of the 21st century, and this legislation has totally abdicated its responsibility to science.

First of all, we have not had any extensive hearings to determine which direction this legislation should take.

□ 1530

It disappoints me that we have the stewardship of responsibility over items such as space and science, research and development, and we have not done the job. It disappoints me that we have not recognized the National Institutes of Standards and their responsibilities for the NEP program and the ATP program.

I have in my hand a letter from the Texas Department of Commerce, arguing vigorously that we should support the NEP program and the Advanced Technology Program, none of which are supported with any vigor in this legislation. We cut research and development some \$2 billion. And then we come down to the lean and mean NASA; we cut jobs, we cut personnel some \$81.5 million.

I am just here to throw up my hands. That is why I will be offering an amendment to restore the \$81.5 million to provide for the personnel in the centers throughout this Nation that have already, Mr. Chairman, suffered the greatest downsizing that we could imagine. If we do not restore that \$81.5 million in the amendment that I am offering, we will see NASA employees in the centers being furloughed for 3 weeks.

Are we addressing the issues of safety and the responsibility we have for the continuation of NASA's programs and certainly the space station? I hope we can come together in a bipartisan manner and look at the Brown substitute that fully responds to research and development; and then, as well, look at the amendments that I will be offering, in particular dealing with the environment, but more particularly the \$81.5 million restoration that we need to ensure that NASA can do the job that the American people want them to do, and to create jobs for the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my opposition to this bill and some of the policies therein. Mr. Chairman, not only do I object to numerous provisions within the legislation, but also to the subversive process by which this bill has made it to the floor.

As you know, the Science Committee has responsibility for our Nation's governmental space, science, research and development activities. These activities encompass enormous taxpayer dollars, thousands of researchers, graduate students and companies and hold within them, the future of our country's technological leadership and prosperity. However, under Republican leadership, our stewardship of these activities has greatly lapsed and over the past year and a half, the Science Committee has abrogated its responsibilities. This is evidenced by the paucity of public hearings we have held on many important issues, by the Republican dominated committee's approval to rely on what are private conversations as justification for policy and funding decisions, these bypassing subcommittees during the legislative process, and extensive partisan gamesmanship which the other side has engaged in.

H.R. 3322 deals with all of the agencies under this committee's jurisdiction including NASA, NSF, parts of the EPA, and NOAA. With this in mind, one would think that the importance of these agencies, what they do, and the money we spend for them would warrant thoughtful consideration by the members of the committee, allowing for adequate debate and consideration. This has not occurred. In previous years, the subcommittees were given an opportunity to lend their expertise and ideas to legislation before it was brought to the full committee—not this year. In previous years, the committee spent many hours of debate and discussion on the programs we oversee—but not this year; we were forced to consider them all in 1 day. Mr. Chairman, what I would simply ask the chairman, what's our purpose when the chairman refuses to allow us to perform the job our constituents elected us for?

Furthermore, when I received this bill, I found to my surprise that there was no Department of Energy title and an absolute ab-

sence of any funding for the external programs at the National Institute of Standards [NIST]. We were told that this year's DOE authorization numbers were included in a floor amendment offered by Mr. WALKER last year. And during committee markup, the chairman said that an amendment regarding the MEP and ATP programs were not relevant to the NIST title. How can that be, NIST administers those programs.

Finally, this bill continues the Republican war against effective public-private partnerships, environmental R&D, and whatever they happen to consider corporate welfare. We Members have been told over and over that for every dollar spent in the MEP and ATP programs, up to \$8 is generated in the economy along with numerous jobs. Mr. WALKER refuses to hear. We have been told that R&D is crucial to stay competitive and that time-to-market is what is driving profits and decisions. Again, Mr. WALKER is in denial.

Regardless of what the chairman says, this bill authorizes about \$2.06 billion less than the President's budget for research and development programs under our jurisdiction. Period. This is a bad bill, brought to the floor and justified by secretive conversations, arbitrary financial and policy decisions and one man's myopic view of the world. It is with great pride that I vote nay, and fight to preserve my children's future.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute that he will offer to this bill later to restore some important NASA and EPA functions. I also rise in support of the amendments that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], will also offer. I also rise in strong support of the space station and in opposition to any amendments which would cut or eliminate funding altogether for the Space Station Program.

Some have argued that it would be fiscally prudent to eliminate the space station. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, it would be terribly imprudent to kill the program we have already invested more than \$12 billion in. Our 12 international partners have spent more than \$4 billion. Actual hardware is being built. To eliminate the program now, after so much of the investment has been made, would be the height of irresponsibility by allowing our investment to be waived.

The Space Station Program is on track and on budget, and the first launch is just over a year from now in November 1997. American contractors have produced more than 80,000 pounds of flight hardware and our international partners have produced more than 60,000 pounds. The space station is no longer a dream but a reality, and it will soon be in orbit, producing tremendous dividends. This is a worthwhile investment and exploration in

science, an investment in jobs and economic growth, an investment in international cooperation, and most of all, an investment in improving life for all of us here on Earth.

The American space program has already made remarkable contributions to technology and medical research during its 35-year history. The space station is the next logical step, a permanent orbiting laboratory capable of long duration research. Let us defeat these amendments to eliminate or cut the space station and keep the program on track.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], our most potent speaker, who I have reserved until last.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I will support the Brown substitute, but failing that I will vote for final passage of the bill. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], for dealing with an issue in this bill, that NASA is now hit with the budget priorities, like every other program, and for including my language that would in fact urge NASA to look at underutilized facilities in depressed communities. It might be a chance for NASA to develop a political strategy. They have none. I think the ivory tower days are over. I would hope they would move out into other areas and develop a truly regional national base of political support. They are certainly going to need it in the future.

I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], I think overall he has done a good job, and the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the charge was made that there were no hearings on this bill. The fact is that there were a number of hearings in the subcommittees on the content of this bill. Maybe Members did not get there for those hearings, but the fact is that hearings were held. We do know what policy direction we need to go.

It was also suggested by the gentleman from California that there was something disingenuous about the nature of the bill. I would simply say that when they stand up and talk about energy bills not coming before the Congress, I spent 20 years on the committee, during which time I do not remember the Democrats ever bringing a comprehensive energy bill before the Congress. They brought pieces, but for the first time in the history of the committee since I have been here, we brought a comprehensive energy bill to the floor last year and, in fact, passed it for a 2-year program. That is the reason why it is not here today.

Mr. Chairman, finally I would simply respond to the gentleman from California when he said that this gentleman had called some of the programs under our jurisdiction liberal claptrap. I

would say to the gentleman, if he can find anywhere in the public or private record where this gentleman has ever made those statements, I would be happy to support his substitute, but I do not think he could ever find anything where this gentleman ever made such a statement. We might want to be somewhat accurate in all of this.

With all that said, this is a very good bill that we bring before the floor. It is in strong support of science, and it is in a fiscally responsible climate. That is what is expected of us. We, on this committee, think we have a commitment to the 7-year balanced budget. We have to plan programs within that context. This bill does good science work in the context of a balanced budget. I would urge people to support it.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, today again, I wish to express my strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE] to eliminate authorization for the space station.

In 1984, the Reagan administration proposed to construct a manned space station that would be in service by 1994 at a cost of \$8 billion. Today, after several redesigns, we have spent \$11 billion and unfortunately have very little to show for it. Current cost projections now estimate that the total cost to build and operate the space station will be at least \$70.8 billion.

While I do not believe we can afford the space station at this time, I do believe we can, and must, afford to wisely invest Government resources in research and technology development. Unfortunately, the space station has taken funds away from many worthy projects such as the Earth Observing System, the National Aerospace Plane, as well as the unmanned space program. In this time of tight budgets, I believe we must invest Federal funds in cost-effective science and technology programs that produce real results—expanding our scientific understanding and increasing our commercial competitiveness in international markets.

I would like to emphasize that a “yes” vote on the bipartisan Roemer-Ganske amendment is not a vote against NASA. Quite the opposite, to support this amendment is to support valuable, cost-effective NASA space and science programs that have been starved by the space station. A vote for the Roemer-Ganske amendment is a vote against the space station—a project that is rapidly losing its scientific missions even as it continues to add billions to our deficit.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, on July 15, 1995, the Secretary of Agriculture wrote to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget indicating that “since many short- and long-term agricultural planning activities are weather dependent, there exists a need for timely meteorological information to support efficient and cost-effective management decisions.” On April 1, 1996, against the interests of the agricultural community, the Department of Commerce’s National Weather Service terminated the Agricultural Weather Service. As it is currently drafted, I believe H.R. 3322 limits our ability to maintain the accuracy and reliability of weather information which is essential for American farmers.

The collection, quality, and reporting of agricultural weather data should remain a Federal

responsibility. Without Federal responsibility to collect and distribute weather data, the specialized forecasts and private sector agricultural weather services may not remain viable. Furthermore, I believe that the private sector has not yet properly demonstrated it is ready to assume responsibility for agricultural weather data collection and dissemination.

The Department of Agriculture is familiar with farming and the collection and dissemination of agricultural weather data. Therefore, I believe that the Department of Agriculture is the most suitable agency for this service. The Department of Agriculture has ongoing relationships with the land-grant colleges and universities, and via the Extension Service can ensure that this information is made available to all producers. Therefore, I would encourage the National Weather Service to work cooperatively with the Department of Agriculture to explore ways to continue to provide agricultural weather data and ultimately transfer this responsibility to the Department of Agriculture.

It is my hope that as Congress continues its work on H.R. 3322, and until such time that action can be taken to transfer the Agricultural Weather Service to the Department of Agriculture, that this important and essential service will be continued through the Department of Commerce. Additionally, funding for this service should continue through Commerce, State, Justice appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by titles, and the first section and each title shall be considered read.

Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 104-565 if offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WALKER], or his designee. That amendment shall be considered read, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Following disposition of amendment No. 8, the Committee shall resume consideration of the bill pursuant to House Resolution 427.

In addition, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on the aforementioned amendments or any amendment thereto and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

If that amendment is adopted, the bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it shall be in order after the disposition of the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], printed in House Report 104-565, to consider the following amendments or germane modifications thereto, which shall be considered in the following order and notwithstanding their amending portions of the bill not yet read for amendment: First, an amendment by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] regarding National Science Foundation funding; second, amendment No. 3 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS]; third, amendment No. 7 by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY]; fourth, amendment No. 22 by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT]; fifth an amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] regarding endocrine disruptors; sixth, amendment No. 2 by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER]; seventh, amendment No. 14 by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN]; and eighth, amendment No. 8 by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike the items relating to subtitle B of title IV.

Page 3, in the table of contents, amend the line relating to subtitle C of title IV to read as follows:

#### SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM SUPPORT

Page 4, in the table of contents, amend the items relating to subtitle D of title IV to read as follows:

#### SUBTITLE C—STREAMLINING OF OPERATIONS

Sec. 441. Programs.

Sec. 442. Reduction in travel budget.

Page 4, in the table of contents, amend the line relating to subtitle E of title IV to read as follows:

#### SUBTITLE D—MISCELLANEOUS

Page 4, in the table of contents, strike the item relating to section 453.

Page 4, in the table of contents, amend the items relating to title VII to read as follows:

#### TITLE VII—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 701. Short title.

Sec. 702. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 703. Research priorities.

Sec. 704. Research Advisory Committees.

Sec. 705. National aviation research plan.

Page 7, lines 11, 13, and 15, strike "(1)".

Page 7, lines 12, 14, and 16, strike "scientific".

Page 12, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

(1) in section 4(g) (42 U.S.C. 1863(g)), by striking "the appropriate rate provided for individuals in grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332" and inserting in

lieu thereof "the maximum rate payable under section 5376";

Page 12, lines 5, 9, and 17, redesignate paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

Page 12, lines 17 through 20, amend paragraph (4), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

(4) in section 14(c) (42 U.S.C. 1873(c))—

(A) by striking "shall receive" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be entitled to receive";

(B) by inserting "including traveltime," after "business of the Foundation"; and

(C) by striking "the rate specified for the daily rate for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332" and inserting in lieu thereof "the maximum rate payable under section 5376"; and

Page 12, lines 21 and 22, strike paragraph (4).

Page 13, lines 19 through 21, amend subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d) SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885b) is amended—

(A) by inserting "AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES" after "MINORITIES IN SCIENCE" in the section heading; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) The Foundation is authorized to undertake and support programs and activities to encourage the participation of persons with disabilities in the science and engineering professions."

(2) Section 36 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885c) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting "persons with disabilities," after "minorities,";

(B) in subsection (b), by amending the second sentence to read as follows: "In addition, the Chairman of the National Science Board may designate members of the Board as ex officio members of the Committee.";

(C) by striking subsections (c) and (d);

(D) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating all Foundation matters relating to participation in, opportunities for, and advancement in education, training and research in science and engineering of women, minorities, persons with disabilities, and other groups currently underrepresented in scientific, engineering, and professional fields.";

(E) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(F) in subsection (d), as so redesignated by subparagraph (E) of this paragraph, by striking "additional".

Page 17, line 1, strike "develop" and insert in lieu thereof "development".

Page 90, line 11, through page 93, line 13, strike subtitle B.

Page 93, line 14, redesignate subtitle C as subtitle B.

Page 94, line 4, through page 97, line 13, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 97, lines 14 and 21, redesignate subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

Page 98, line 1, redesignate subtitle D as subtitle C.

Page 98, lines 6 through 11, strike paragraphs (1) through (4).

Page 98, lines 16 through 21, strike paragraphs (8) through (12).

Page 99, lines 5 through 9, strike paragraphs (17) and (18).

Page 98, line 12, through page 99, line 10, redesignate paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (13), (14), (15), (16), and (19) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively.

Page 99, line 19, through page 100, line 7, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 100, line 8, strike "LIMITATIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS" and insert in lieu thereof "REDUCTION IN TRAVEL BUDGET".

Page 100, lines 9 through 15, strike "(a) MAXIMUM AMOUNT" and all that follows through "TRAVEL BUDGET.—"

Page 100, line 20, through page 103, line 24, strike section 443.

Page 104, line 1, redesignate subtitle E as subtitle D.

Page 106, line 9, through page 116, line 9, strike section 453.

Page 119, line 1, strike "Environmental" and insert in lieu thereof "Environment".

Page 124, line 9, through page 129, line 3, strike sections 702 through 705.

Page 129, line 4, redesignate section 706 as section 702.

Page 130, line 10, insert "and" after "activities";

Page 130, lines 12 through 18, strike "; and" and all that follows through "Facilities and Equipment".

Page 130, line 19, redesignate section 707 as section 703.

Page 131, line 9, through page 132, line 5, strike section 708.

Page 132, line 6, redesignate section 709 as section 704.

Page 133, line 1, redesignate section 710 as section 705.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one that we had attempted to work out with everyone concerned, and allows us to expedite the process of deliberating the bill on the floor. The administration forwarded their draft authorization bill for the National Science Foundation to the committee the night before our markup. At that time we were not able to include several of the technical amendments in our bill.

In consultation with the minority, amendments to NSF can be termed technical and administrative, and we know of no opposition to these amendments that are included in the manager's amendment that I offering. Further amendments in this particular manager's amendment relate to title IV, the NOAA authorization, which strike provisions of shared jurisdiction between the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources. The removal of these provisions will help expedite the bill.

Finally, we have language in this amendment which strikes several provisions in title VII, the FAA research, engineering, and development authorization. The gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Technology on the Committee on Science, is working with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to craft language relating to these provisions. Again, this actually allows the committee to move forward with H.R. 3322 on the floor.

I wish to thank the subcommittee chairman and the chairmen of the

other concerned committees for their efforts to deal with these revisions and bring them before the House. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

#### TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Conforms language to the reduction of directorates; corrects obsolete references to the GS-18 pay scale; allows members of the Science Board to decline their compensation; broadens the Engineering Equal Opportunities Act to include persons with disabilities; and allows the Chairman of the National Science Board to appoint ex-officio members to review committees.

#### TITLE IV—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Drops the following programs within the joint jurisdiction of the Committee's on Science and Resources: All National Ocean Service [NOS] programs authorization, including the Coastal Ocean Program; the Ocean and Great Lakes Program authorizations and terminations under the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research [OAR] including the termination of the National Undersea Research Program and the authorization of the National Sea Grant College Program; the authorization of the marine services account and the termination's of the NOAA Corps and the NOAA Fleet Modernization Program; language establishing the National Ocean Partnership Program; and language setting a cap on total appropriations for the Operations, Research and Facilities Account of NOAA.

#### TITLE VII—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

The manager's amendment strikes the following sections/provisions from the bill: section 702, Findings—outlined committee findings regarding the FAA's delays in fielding new products and services, including long-standing internal management, organizational, and cultural impediments to improving its acquisition processes; section 703, Definitions—defined acquisition management teams used in section 704 of title VII; section 704, Management Principles (i.e., "guiding principles")—mandated guiding principles for conducting Federal Aviation Administration research, engineering, and development activities; section 705, Document of April 1, 1996—FAA's recently implemented acquisition management system; section 706, Authorization of Appropriations; item K—authorized such sums as may be necessary for other research, engineering, and development activities conducted under the Engineering, Development, Test, and Evaluation activity of the Facilities and Equipment account; and section 708, Budget Designation For Federal Aviation Administration Research and Development Activities—Required that future FAA budgets include in a single budget category all research and development activities that would be classified as basic research, applied research, or developmental under the guidelines established by OMB in Budget Circular A-11.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chair, do I have to be opposed to this amendment to claim this time?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say I do not intend to oppose the chairman's amendment. He has consulted with us with regard to this amendment. I think the purpose of it clearly is to expedite the process of the committee this afternoon, plus correcting a few mistakes that were made in the original bill. I am more than happy to accommodate the chairman with regard to that.

I did want to take a minute, however, Mr. Chairman, to apologize to the chairman if I accused him of using the term "liberal claptrap." That was not my intention. That was the patented phrase of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER]. I thought I indicated that it was Members on the other side who used those two terms, but not specifically the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has patented the term "corporate welfare." I propose to carefully distinguish between these two divisions in the Federal research and development budget whenever I can.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I plead guilty. I said that global warming at best is unproven, and at worst, liberal claptrap. I plead guilty.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I knew the gentleman would say that. He has been unabashed in his reference to these programs in those terms. I admire him for that, as a matter of fact. I think it is an artful phrase, as is the term "corporate welfare," and it serves as a hook on which Members can say all sorts of things about programs that they do not like. First they can call them liberal claptrap, and then say why they do not like them.

One other thing about the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] at which I do take umbrage. He said he has been on the committee for 20 years. If he finishes this year, that will be correct. He then said that there had been no energy bills passed by the committee during that time. Then I think he qualified that by saying there had been occasional efforts at doing portions of a bill.

I would remind the gentleman of the fact that in 1992 we had the Energy Policy Act of 1992, appropriately named, which was a comprehensive, although not absolutely all-inclusive, energy bill, and as a matter of fact, we are still being guided for many of the things done in the Department of Energy by that Energy Policy Act, which was an authorization bill of 1992.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] takes delight in disparaging the record of the committee before he became chairman, but if he will just stick to the facts I

will be glad to agree with him. I am not particularly proud of the record that we have made, and with the help of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] we tried to remedy that many times. He understands the problems in getting an energy authorization bill passed.

It had been my hope that under his leadership we would get an energy policy bill passed. We have not yet, and I would confidently predict we will not during the remainder of his term as chairman, but if there is a possibility, I would be more than happy to work with the gentleman, because I think we share a desire that the Committee on Science participate fully in the authorization of all programs under our jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this amendment. I strongly support the manager's amendment, perhaps more than the manager himself.

Mr. Chairman, during committee markup of H.R. 3322, Democrats expressed two fundamental concerns over the structure of this bill. First, the bill seemed designed to capture many programs that were not under the jurisdiction of the Science Committee. Second, the bill took great pains to avoid addressing some agencies that were under the jurisdiction of the Science Committee.

The most obvious problem with the bill in the first instance was its inclusion of the ocean, coastal, and fishery programs within NOAA. As was brought out in our markup, the bill did not attempt to authorize these programs, it attempted to deauthorize them. In particular, the bill sought to eliminate NOAA's role in the Coastal Zone Management Act that was coincidentally reauthorized the day before as a part of the Republican celebration of Earth Day. The bill also contained hostile provisions directed at the Sea Grant Program, the National Marine Fisheries Service and several other important programs. These were not programs that were addressed in any hearing before the Science Committee, yet extensive policy and detailed funding decisions were made a part of the bill.

During the markup, Ms. RIVERS of Michigan offered an amendment to remove these programs from the bill and provide the opportunity to the Committee on Resources to establish more acceptable funding levels for these programs. Her amendment was defeated along party lines. I would stress that every Republican on our committee that voted to authorize the Coastal Zone Management Act on the floor on April 23, voted to deauthorize the program on April 24. Members who spoke to House cameras in warm glowing terms about the Sea Grant Program, voted in committee to slash it. Members who spoke about the importance of the ocean sciences voted to virtually eliminate them.

At the time of Ms. RIVERS' amendment, Democrats were characterized by majority members of the committee in very unflattering terms and were accused of playing politics. I would only point out that our opposition to the structure of the bill was hardly rooted in partisan politics. Indeed, I strongly subscribe to the letter sent by the chair of the Resources Committee describing his perceptions of this state of affairs. He accurately described the absence of any attempt on the part of the

Chair to develop a consensus on these programs as a major factor in the state of legislative gridlock that befell last year's science authorization bill.

What the manager's amendment does not do today is fix the other half of the problem—that is the absence of an authorization for other programs in our jurisdiction. The NIST extramural programs and the Department of Energy R&D programs are vital to many members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. Procedural manipulations were found to exclude these from the bill, but this does not make them less valuable and does not remove them from the responsibility of our committee. Later, Members will be given a chance to vote for these vital programs when they consider my amendment to H.R. 3322—an amendment that fully funds these programs at the President's request levels.

I will close by again stating my support for this amendment. I believe it will improve the bill and provide a better chance for the programs in question to receive a fair treatment before the proper committees of jurisdiction.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my support for the chairman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, maybe with that statement we can get past all the internal squabbles in the committee and so on and actually get to discussing real policy here on the floor with regard to science policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1545

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

**Subtitle A—National Science Foundation Authorization**

Sec. 111. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 112. Proportional reduction of research and related activities amounts.

Sec. 113. Consultation and representation expenses.

Sec. 114. Reprogramming.

**Subtitle B—General Provisions**

Sec. 121. Annual Report.

Sec. 122. National research facilities.

Sec. 123. Eligibility for research facility awards.

Sec. 124. Administrative amendments.

Sec. 125. Indirect costs.

Sec. 126. Financial disclosure.

Sec. 127. Educational leave of absence for active duty.

Sec. 128. Science Studies Institute.

Sec. 129. Educational impact.

Sec. 130. Divisions of the Foundation.

Sec. 131. National Science and Engineering Foundation.

**TITLE II—NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION**

**Subtitle A—General Provisions**

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Findings.

Sec. 203. Definitions.

**Subtitle B—Authorization of Appropriations**  
**CHAPTER 1—AUTHORIZATIONS**

Sec. 211. Human space flight.

Sec. 212. Science, aeronautics, and technology.

Sec. 213. Mission support.

Sec. 214. Inspector General.

Sec. 215. Total authorization.

Sec. 216. Office of Commercial Space Transportation Authorization.

Sec. 217. Office of Space Commerce.

**CHAPTER 2—RESTRUCTURING THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION**

Sec. 221. Findings.

Sec. 222. Restructuring reports.

**CHAPTER 3—LIMITATIONS AND SPECIAL AUTHORITY**

Sec. 231. Use of funds for construction.

Sec. 232. Availability of appropriated amounts.

Sec. 233. Reprogramming for construction of facilities.

Sec. 234. Consideration of committees.

Sec. 235. Limitations on obligation of unauthorized appropriations.

Sec. 236. Use of funds for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses.

**Subtitle C—International Space Station**

Sec. 241. Findings.

Sec. 242. Commercialization of Space Station.

Sec. 243. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 244. Space Station accounting report.

**Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Provisions**

Sec. 251. Commercial Space launch amendments.

Sec. 252. Requirement for independent cost analysis.

Sec. 253. Office of Space Commerce.

Sec. 254. National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 amendments.

Sec. 255. Procurement.

Sec. 256. Additional National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities.

Sec. 257. Purchase of space science data.

Sec. 258. Plan for Mission to Planet Earth.

Sec. 259. Acquisition of earth remote sensing data.

Sec. 260. Shuttle privatization.

Sec. 261. Launch voucher demonstration program amendments.

Sec. 262. Privatization of microgravity parabolic flight operations.

Sec. 263. Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan Act of 1949 amendments.

Sec. 264. Use of abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities.

Sec. 265. Cost effectiveness calculations.

Sec. 266. Procurement ombudsman.

Sec. 267. Authority to reduce or suspend contract payments based on substantial evidence of fraud.

**TITLE III—UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION**

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 303. Fire safety systems in Army housing.

Sec. 304. Successor fire safety standards.

Sec. 305. Termination or privatization of functions.

Sec. 306. Report on budgetary reduction.

**TITLE IV—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION**

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Definitions.

**Subtitle A—Atmospheric, Weather, and Satellite Programs**

Sec. 411. National Weather Service.

Sec. 412. Atmospheric research.

Sec. 413. National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service.

**Subtitle B—Marine Research**

Sec. 421. National Ocean Service.

Sec. 422. Ocean and Great Lakes research.

**Subtitle C—Program Support**

Sec. 431. Program support.

**Subtitle D—Streamlining of Operations**

Sec. 441. Programs.

Sec. 442. Limitations on appropriations.

Sec. 443. Termination of the Corps of Commissioned Officers.

**Subtitle E—Miscellaneous**

Sec. 451. Weather data buoys.

Sec. 452. Duties of the National Weather Service.

Sec. 453. National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

**TITLE V—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Definitions.

Sec. 503. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 504. Scientific research review.

Sec. 505. Graduate student fellowships.

Sec. 506. Science Advisory Board.

**TITLE VI—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY**

Sec. 601. Authorization of appropriations.

**TITLE VII—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT**

Sec. 701. Short title.

Sec. 702. Findings.

Sec. 703. Definitions.

Sec. 704. Management principles.

Sec. 705. Document of April 1, 1996.

Sec. 706. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 707. Research priorities.

Sec. 708. Budget designation for Federal Aviation Administration research and development activities.

Sec. 709. Research Advisory Committees.

Sec. 710. National aviation research plan.

**TITLE VIII—NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM**

Sec. 801. Authorization of appropriations.

**TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS**

Sec. 901. Prohibition of lobbying activities.

Sec. 902. Limitation on appropriations.

Sec. 903. Eligibility for awards.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHIFF: Page 6, line 21, strike "\$3,250,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,291,700,000".

Page 6, line 25, strike "\$2,340,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,381,500,000".

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment, if adopted, would raise the authorization figure for the research and related activities account of the National Science Foundation by \$41.2 million. At the time the



House Committee on Science was voting to pass H.R. 3322, the bill we have before us today, the House Committee on the Budget had not yet presented the proposed budget resolution to the full House of Representatives.

On May 16 of this year, the Committee on the Budget proposed and the House of Representatives adopted a budget resolution for fiscal year 1997. In that budget resolution, there was a raise in the same account by the same amount of \$41.2 million. So, in other words, my amendment would raise the authorization for the research and related activities account of the National Science Foundation by exactly the amount that we passed in the budget resolution a short time ago.

I want to personally commend Chairman WALKER of the Committee on Science, who is also, of course, vice chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, who I know was instrumental in pressing for this increase in basic research authorization.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we should continue to seek all of the authorization for which we can be fiscally responsible, that is, for which the funds can be identified and found to support Federal research. Since we have accomplished that through the budget resolution, I would like to make our bill here today, H.R. 3322, match the budget resolution in the same account.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although I anticipate much partisanship in the debate over H.R. 3322, I want to point out that the National Science Foundation enjoys strong bipartisan support. I want to thank Basic Research Subcommittee Chairman SCHIFF for the professional, nonpartisan manner in which he has conducted himself on all matters within Basic Research's jurisdiction, including the NSF.

On the NSF budget generally, I hope that we will continue to maintain our history of bipartisan advocacy. The support that NSF provides in meeting a wide variety of challenges in math, science, and engineering education cannot be overstated. In my region, both Carnegie-Mellon University and the University of Pittsburgh rely heavily on NSF support to conduct important research in a number of areas.

What concerns me enough to rise at this point, is the future of NSF's Supercomputing Program. The Basic Research Subcommittee has held two hearings relating to the Supercomputing Program, one on the high performance computing and communications initiative in general, and one on NSF's decision to recompute its Supercomputing Program. The common theme in these two hearings was that we are letting funding issues compromise the integrity of what has been recognized by Members in both parties as a model program.

What especially disturbs me is NSF's decision to "recompute" its leading edge centers based upon the findings of

the Hayes Report. The Hayes Report found that there needed to be greater emphasis placed on regional computing centers in order to ease the extreme burden being placed on the four leading-edge centers. I agree that the best way to help meet the demands for user time at the leading-edge centers is to increase the capabilities of the regional centers. If there are projects that require less capacity, or the merits of larger projects can be initially judged at the regional centers, then we should pursue it. What troubles me is that the only way anyone has chosen to enhance the regional centers is at the expense of the leading-edge centers. In other words, NSF has decided that the way to solve one problem is to create another, potentially more serious problem.

We are confronted with a situation where, in order to enhance the ability to access a valuable research tool, we are going to reduce that tool's capacity. I know that this situation is of concern to Members on both sides of the aisle. During the hearing on the Supercomputing Program there were many Members in both parties who said that if money was the only force driving the downsizing of leading-edge centers, then we should find the money elsewhere and not deconstruct one of our Government's greatest success stories.

I do not take issue with formalizing the relationships between leading-edge and regional facilities through the proposed partnership centers. However, witnesses at our hearing seemed quite clear that there was nothing about the reorganization that was leading to a potential downsizing of leading-edge centers. Rather, it was budgetary concerns that were driving this process.

In response to a question posed by Congressman BOEHLERT, Dr. Ed Hayes, chairman of the task force on the Future of NSF Supercomputing Centers, stated:

The concern is that . . . if these [Partnership] centers come into being and the NSF budget did not grow at a rate significantly above inflation for this program, you would not be able to keep up with the recapitalization cycle that would be necessary to keep the leading-edge sites at a level that would be sufficiently interesting to draw the very best researchers . . .

Later, in response to a question I posed about why we were considering downsizing centers that were over subscribed, Dr. Hayes said:

And if the NSF budget would support, with the recapitalization I mentioned earlier, more than the minimum of two [Partnership Centers] that we were strongly pushing for, then within the concept of the partnership I think there will be quite a comfort level and enthusiasm for doing that.

Despite the assertions of NSF that funding is not the issue here, our committee's hearing record seems to indicate otherwise. Rather, it seems to me that the recompetition is based upon NSF trying to predict future funding decisions by the Congress. In this case, it seems like the analysis of the task

force was done correctly, but they then went beyond the scope of their mission by presupposing future funding decisions by Congress.

My admonition to the NSF is not to base policy decisions by guessing how the Science Committee is going to act. As we just witnessed with the Schiff amendment, preordained authorization caps have a way of changing around here. If current funding for the Supercomputing Program is not sufficient to keep the United States as a world leader in high-speed computing, let us know, and we will act accordingly.

I do not intend to offer an amendment at this point. But I do want to put the NSF on notice that there are many Members of Congress who are watching the recompetition with a watchful eye, and are not necessarily pleased with what they have seen so far.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico has described the situation in which we find ourselves with regard to this amendment. The budget did permit some additional latitude for some spending in the basic research accounts at the NSF, and so I am very much supportive of what the gentleman has decided to do here, because we are obviously then conducting this increase within the context of the balanced budget to which the House has agreed.

I do want to point out that this amount of money would then actually increase the House-passed levels for basic science within the National Science Foundation to a level above that which the administration requested, and I think also that it indicates our commitment to continuing this.

With regard to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just stated, I personally have visited the supercomputing center in Pittsburgh, and agree that those supercomputing centers are a valuable part of the network that we are establishing across the country and that NSF needs to be cognizant of that. While NSF has claimed that there are no particular money problems, that this is largely a policy-related issue that is being done, the fact is that this increase in the Schiff amendment does give them sufficient resources within this account to do a number of things, plusing up university accounts, dealing more meaningfully with supercomputers.

There are a number of things that NSF has it within their capacity to do. I hope that they do resolve the problems with regard to supercomputers in a way that assures that the Nation has a strong foundation, because obviously the communication tools of the future have a great deal to do with the knowledge economy of the future.

So I certainly would indicate that the gentleman has raised a legitimate issue. It is one that the committee will continue to watch from the standpoint of NSF. I thank the gentleman from

New Mexico for his amendment. I think it is a valuable addition to the bill.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would not normally belabor this point and delay action on this very meritorious amendment, but I always have the feeling that we are getting a certain spin attached to these amendments which kind of rankles me a little bit, and so I have to get up and give my own spin although I end up supporting the amendment likewise.

As was the case with the authorization bill last year, the same is true this year. Each subcommittee was given a ceiling by the chairman of the full committee which was slavishly adhered to in the subcommittee. The result for NSF for last year, fiscal year 1996, is that the authorization passed last year by the House but not yet enacted into law, of course, is \$94 million less than the actual appropriations bill. So now after our committee has reported the bill and following the results of the fiscal year 1996 appropriations process, which was just completed a few weeks ago, we are now adding \$40 million to NSF's research accounts that was done in the Committee on Appropriations and we now have an amendment to raise our authorization level by a similar amount. This could have been avoided, of course, if the committee had been allowed to follow its own best judgment last year.

This additional funding will provide enough growth to at least offset inflation as opposed to the 1-percent increase provided in the underlying bill as reported by the committee. Because of the strong sentiments that the majority has expressed in support of basic research, it was surprising to me that so little growth was provided in the core research activities of NSF. The Democratic substitute, which I offered in committee, of course, attempted to correct this miserly treatment of NSF's research account by providing growth of nearly 5 percent above the fiscal year 1996 appropriation, but our proposal in committee was rejected on a party line vote.

While I support the increase provided by the amendment, I am nevertheless disappointed that it is still \$40 million below the level in the Democratic substitute which I am offering later today. This may seem like a relatively small difference, but it translates into a loss of 500 individual research grants to university researchers. Basically this amendment will only allow research project funding to stay even with inflation. It provides no real growth which advances fundamental knowledge and underpins the technological strength of the Nation.

I am also disappointed that the amendment is limited to raising the

authorization level just for the research account. No increase is proposed to raise the allocation for the internal operations of the agency which have been cut by \$7 million below the 1996 appropriation level. This is an extreme cut for an agency which consumes only 4 percent of its total budget on internal operations and which has maintained a constant work force for the past decade while the workload has doubled. NSF estimates that a cut of this magnitude translates into a loss of up to 120 staff positions, or about 10 percent of its work force.

While I support this amendment, I do not believe it goes far enough to ensure the continuance of a vigorous and well-managed program at NSF.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF]. The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEKAS: Page 87, after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(h) REPORT.—Section 704 of the Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) REPORT.—The National Weather Service shall conduct a review of the NEXRAD Network radar coverage pattern for a determination of areas of inadequate radar coverage. After conducting such review, the National Weather Service shall prepare and submit to the Congress, no later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996, a report which—

“(1) assesses the feasibility of existing and future Federal Aviation Administration Terminal Doppler Weather Radars to provide reliable weather radar data, in a cost-efficient manner, to nearby weather forecast offices; and

“(2) makes recommendations for the implementation of the findings of the report.”.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues that I must precede the text of my amendment, an explanation of it, by a brief history of what brings us to the floor today.

In recent history of the National Weather Service in our area, in central Pennsylvania, we learned several years ago, to our dismay, that the reorganization of the National Weather Service apparatus was going to include a transfer of the National Weather Service headquarter, from Harrisburg, the capital of the State, to State College, the home of Penn State, for its real nexus in the weather service planning that was then going on.

□ 1600

We expressed our concerns, those of us who live in and represent the people

of the central Pennsylvania area around Harrisburg, because we felt that any such move would create gaps in the coverage that historically was well covered by the Harrisburg center. Well, as it turned out, we were overruled, and the move was authorized and actually made.

Now, what happened in 1994, a tornado hit in the city of Harrisburg, in the capital city, feet away, just yardage away as it were, from the former weather station, and it went undetected. Now, here is the weather station at State College, with NEXRAD capacity, state-of-the-art, high velocity and high capacity weather service predictable apparatus, and the tornado in Harrisburg was missed.

We believed then and we believe now that this was a kind of a gap that was created by the positioning of NEXRAD in State College, which by the rationale of the topography itself would overshoot the very site where this little tornado occurred.

Well, if that was not enough, several other little incidents happened and episodes were not detected. So in 1995, a year ago, right in this Chamber, on a similar bill, we in the front of the subcommittee then chaired, still chaired, by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], we offered a simple amendment to try to remedy this gap situation. Then we learned that there were many other sectors of the country where similar gaps were occurring.

When the committee held hearings on this same subject, many of our colleagues testified to the very same kind of gap. What we came up with in central Pennsylvania, through the auspices of some people who work for the National Weather Service and other experts, was that some of these gaps could be filled by simply piggybacking with the Federal Aviation Administration, the FAA, capacity at nearby airports.

Harrisburg International Airport, which is also at the footstep of the capital of the Commonwealth, was in operation and we felt that maybe we ought to contact them and see whether they could fill the gap in on some of these related episodes that the State College facility could not pick up.

At any state, we offered an amendment to study the feasibility of such a piggybacking capability, and the committee and then the House passed this amendment and the bill to which it was attached, and so we were on our way, we felt, to solving this problem. Well, the bill never really became law, and then we found ourselves trying to fight the same battles.

Now, what happened? The Secretary of Commerce, in response to a mandate, issued in 1995, in October 1995, a report on this very same subject, and in that report, “The Secretary's Report to Congress on Adequacy of NEXRAD Coverage and Degradation of Weather Services Under National Weather Service Modernization for 32 Areas of Concern,” that is the title of the report,

which acknowledges just in the title that there was a degradation of national weather services and also that there was a problem with the adequacy of NEXRAD coverage, in that they come up with a recommendation in this report, and I am reading directly from the report now, which says that the team, the team that works on these projects, finds that there is significant potential for weather data from these radars, meaning the FAA radars, to enhance the quality control of WSR-88-D data and to provide valuable additional viewing angle perspectives for particular storms, which is an exact composition to what we were averring back in 1994 and 1995 about filling in the gaps.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEKAS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GEKAS. So my amendment, Mr. Chairman, which I understand both the minority and the majority have agreed to incorporate into the legislation, simply follows through with the Secretary of Commerce's recommendations to have a biagency task force look into the further feasibility of what we have proposed now for 2 years. In this way we can begin to fill those gaps that, unfortunately, have been occurring too often, and in too many places across the Nation.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

I want to compliment the gentleman for the assiduous way in which he has carried out the pursuit of trying to upgrade the Weather Service as it involves his particular area, and I am sure he would also want to do that for the other parts of the country as well.

He has correctly reported the facts here, and any earlier objections I may have had to past amendments that the gentleman had were not based on their merits, but on the feeling that we would probably be able to accomplish these things by putting the pressure necessity on the various agencies that are involved. It turns out, of course, that the National Weather Service has been persuaded by his continued concern and by others' to follow essentially the path which he recommended, without the passage of any additional legislation.

So I would urge other Members to be as diligent in pursuing such worthy objectives as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has, and that these objectives can frequently be obtained by such diligent effort without the necessity of passing additional legislation which can sometimes be misinterpreted.

Now, part of my problem was I have Members from all over the country coming to me, complaining in the same way that the gentleman had about the inadequacy of the coverage and the problems related from this transfer that we are making to try to upgrade

Weather Service capability. I have had to tell them I do not think we need a separate law to correct this, that we can correct it in the fashion that the gentleman has exemplified here, and I just want to commend the gentleman for what he has done.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Gekas amendment encourages the National Weather Service to follow through on the Secretary of Commerce's recommendation to initiate a dialogue with the FAA to assist in the potential for the National Weather Service using FAA weather radar.

This is a good amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I think we have put so much faith in this new system, NEXRAD, that we have overlooked some basics and I think we have put some communities at risk. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] very ably here articulates the fact of what happened in his community. There are other communities like mine that are waiting for some of these things to happen.

We have gotten so sophisticated, I think we have lost a little common-sense. This is a good amendment and I am not quite so sure it even goes far enough. I think the Congress must review the lifesaving ability of having more eyes and ears and radar activities looking at volatile weather than we have the right now, and this is a step in that direction, but certainly will not be our final answer.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio poses an interesting question. I am wondering, too, whether or not we ought to be conducting a review of NEXRAD and how it has worked in its brief lifetime, because many of these problems were foreseen at the time that the reorganization was instituted, and now it is not enough for us to say I told you so.

I believe that what the gentleman has said may prompt us to get together and see if there is some kind of easy review we can make of the NEXRAD capacity. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to work with the gentleman on that. I think he has very ably brought us to a position where maybe something might be done here that might help the country in a lot of areas that have not had some of the problems that he has had but might be waiting for those disasters to happen.

With that, I support the amendment, and I want to compliment the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Committee on Science in a colloquy concerning authorization for NEXRAD radars for the National Weather Service.

Is it not the case that this bill in the 1992 authorization, Public Law 102-567, authorized full funding for the administration's request for the NEXRAD line items?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, as the report indicates, the gentleman correctly states that the committee supports the administration's request for NEXRAD systems acquisition of \$53,145,000 in fiscal year 1997.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, the President's request includes funding for a new NEXRAD unit to be placed in the vicinity of Fort Wayne, IN, and new units in the southeast Tennessee/northern Alabama region, and in Arkansas, as recommended by the Secretary of Commerce. Is obligation of funds for these units in fiscal year 1997 consistent with the limitations contained in section 411(c) of the bill?

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will further yield, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the Secretary intends to make the certificate necessary under Public Law 102-567 in section 411 and has every expectation to be able to do so.

The language in H.R. 3322, subject to the Secretary's certification and inclusion in the fiscal year 1997 National Weather Service implementation plan, enables the construction of the three units noted by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his clarification and his leadership on this bill and in ensuring that areas vulnerable to severe weather receive adequate warning. This is a critical safety concern for northeast Indiana because our State ranks first in the Nation in tornado deaths. You might say we have twisted twisters. We very much appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman WALKER, and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment seven by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY  
Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THORNBERRY: Page 87, after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(h) NEXRAD OPERATIONAL AVAILABILITY AND RELIABILITY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall take immediate steps to ensure that NEXRADs operated by the Department of Defense that provide primary detection coverage over a portion of their range function as fully committed, reliable elements of the national weather radar network, operating with the same standards, quality, and availability as the National Weather Service-operated NEXRADs.

(2) NEXRADs operated by the Department of Defense that provide primary detection coverage over a portion of their range are to be considered as integral parts of the National Weather Radar Network.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the exact same as an amendment that was accepted by all sides on this bill last year and it seeks to deal with a subset of the problem that we have already heard some discussion of, and that is inadequacies of coverage in the new doppler radar system.

Most of the country is protected by radar which are run by the National Weather Service. However, some of the country is protected by radars which are run by the Department of Defense, and it is those radars which feed into the National Weather Service system to provide coverage.

For example, in a great part of my district, primary coverage is provided by a radar run by the Air Force near Frederick, OK and backup service for that area is provided by a radar by the Air Force out of Dyess Air Force Base near Abilene. Now, the difficulty arises because the radars run by the Department of Defense are not held to the same standards as the radars which are operated by the National Weather Service themselves. So what we have experienced in our area are that communication lines go down, power to the radar goes down, and often, when we most need these radars, they are simply unavailable.

As a matter of fact, studies by the National Research Council and the GAO confirm that these DOD radar are simply not available as much as National Weather Service radar, and the effect is they simply do not offer the same level of protection as the National Weather Service radar.

My amendment simply says that DOD radar in the system have to meet the same standards as the National Weather Service radars so that there will be no second class of coverage for anybody in this country.

Now, since we have had this debate last year, I have to report that the situation in my particular region has gotten better. And I appreciate the efforts of the Air Force, the National Weather Service, and others involved in making sure the radar is available more of the time than it was the time before. In particular, I want to thank the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, who has helped bring this problem to the attention of the relevant agencies and pressed them as we move forward for modernization to make sure nobody is left behind. The chairman of the subcommittee has been helpful as well.

I know all Members share my determination to make sure that there is no second class of coverage and that those folks who are relying on the DOD radar get the same amount of coverage at least as the folks who rely on the National Weather Service radar.

Mr. Chairman, hopefully, one of these days we will have a rain cloud in my district so that we can really put this system to the test. We look forward to that day, but in the meantime, I appreciate my colleagues supporting this amendment.

□ 1615

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] is similar to an amendment adopted by the full House last year. It requires the Department of Defense to live up to its commitment to provide NEXRAD radar coverage in selected regions of the country.

DOD's NEXRAD radar is an important component of our Nation's weather coverage. If DOD does not supply the National Weather Service with the NEXRAD it has agreed to supply, gaps in the coverage will occur.

So the amendment of the gentleman from Texas addresses this, and I commend the gentleman for his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 137, after line 4, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 904. BUY AMERICAN.**

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any recipient of a grant under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, should purchase, when available and cost-effective, American made equipment and products when expending grant monies.

(b) NOTICE OF RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In allocating grants under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, the Secretary shall provide to each recipient a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take off on something that was mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

This is the last year here in Congress for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and I would like to say to the gentleman, if I can get his attention, I want to commend him for distinguished service to his district, to the Congress and to the country. He has been a Member that said "no" around here at the times he had to.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I think everybody understands it. I would like to see more American products purchased with more of our procurement dollars, because American workers get a paycheck and pay the taxes for all of these "Buck Rogers" experiments that are not reality. I think it is very important.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman WALKER, who could have raised points of order on a couple of appropriation bills on more significant buy American language, and he did not. I believe this is reasonable. This language affords an opportunity for recipients of grants to be encouraged, wherever feasible, to buy American-made products. They are to get a notice to that effect, and hopefully that will happen.

In the year to come, I will be asking for a report, an investigation that would monitor the types of procurement and the dollars that are spent on products that may not be made in America, and if those products were available here, at a cost-competitive price.

So finally, in also saying that, I urge the committee to also look forward to participatory moneys pledged by other nations and governments who are to explore space with us and make sure we just do not get another song and dance from them; that we actually get some of their yens and some of their deutsche marks and some of their cash.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words. As the gentleman knows, it is much easier to say yes around here than it is to say no, and I appreciate his comment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say no to the gentleman's amendment. I am going to agree with the gentleman's amendment and urge the House to adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

AMENDMENT 266, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. ROEMER:

Page 122, after line 9, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 507. ENDOCRINE DISRUPTER RESEARCH PLANNING.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Endocrine Disrupter Research Planning Act of 1996".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) recent reports in the media have focused public attention on a possible link between exposure to chemicals that may mimic hormones and may have adverse biological effects in humans and wildlife, including carcinogenic, reproductive, neurological, and immunological effects, now commonly referred to as endocrine disrupters;

(2) given the significant scientific uncertainties concerning the effects of such endocrine disrupters on humans and wildlife, it cannot at this time be concluded whether or not endocrine disrupters constitute a significant threat to human health or the environment;

(3) neither a conclusion that endocrine disrupters pose an imminent and serious threat to human health and the environment, nor a conclusion that the risks are insignificant or exaggerated, is warranted based on the present state of scientific knowledge;

(4) additional research is needed to more accurately characterize the risks of endocrine disrupters;

(5) risk assessment principles should be used to guide the development of a coordinated research plan to ensure that research results are relevant and adequate to objectively estimate risk to guide future public policy decisions;

(6) research carried out by the Federal Government should be done in a planned and coordinated manner to ensure that limited resources are spent efficiently and that critical information gaps are filled as quickly as possible; and

(7) researchers from academia, industry, and Federal laboratories should coordinate efforts to prioritize research topics, identify capital needs, and, in general, develop a comprehensive research plan to address important scientific and policy questions surrounding the potential effects of such chemicals.

(c) **RESEARCH PLANNING REPORT.**—

(1) **REPORT.**—The Administrator, in coordination with other Federal agencies with scientific expertise in areas relevant to assessing the human health and ecological risks of endocrine disrupters, shall submit to Congress, along with the President's Budget Request for Fiscal Year 1998, a plan for conducting research needed to objectively assess and characterize the risk of endocrine disrupters on human health and environment.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The plan submitted under this section shall include—

(A) the role of each participating agency in the research plan and the resources required by each agency to carry out the research plan, including human and capital resources needed to ensure that agencies have appropriate expertise, facilities, and analytical capabilities to meet the goals of the research plan;

(B) the mechanisms by which each agency will carry out research, including the use of Federal laboratory facilities, extramural grants and contracts, and cooperative research and development agreements with universities, research centers, and the private sector, and mechanisms to avoid duplication of effort and for appropriate peer review, including independent and external

peer review of Federal agency intramural research;

(C) specific research strategies and timeliness for addressing the critical information gaps with respect to hazard identification, dose-response assessment, and exposure assessment; and

(D) an assessment of the current state of scientific knowledge concerning effects of synthetic and naturally occurring endocrine disrupters on human health and the environment, including identification of scientific uncertainties unlikely to be capable of significant resolution in the near term, studies which support or fail to support conclusions of adverse public health effects, and the opportunity for public comment on such assessment.

(d) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this section is intended to alter, or otherwise affect any statutory authority of the Environmental Protection Agency or any other Federal regulatory agency or regulate substances which may pose a threat to the public health or the environment.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. ROEMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on endocrine disrupters. Before I get into what this amendment does and what we hope to accomplish with it, I think I should explain what endocrines are and what endocrine disrupters are.

Endocrines are chemicals that control many functions of the human body, including our ability to reproduce, grow up, metabolize food, and fight diseases.

Endocrine disrupters are chemicals in the environment that imitate these hormonal chemicals and potentially alter growth, reproduction, and other biological functions in animals and humans.

Reports in many works of scientific literature, including "Our Stolen Future," this book that I hold in my hand by Theo Colburn, among others, indicate that some man-made chemicals have endocrine effects in birds and other wildlife that result in abnormal development and potential reproductive problems. High levels of certain man-made endocrine disrupting chemicals have been associated with increased rates of breast cancer in some human beings.

Thus, some endocrine disrupters are man-made chemicals. Others are naturally occurring substances.

A wide variety of substances, including pesticides, "plasticizers" and breakdown products from detergents, have been shown to have the ability to act in some cases as endocrine disrupters.

For example, the microwaving of food in plastic containers may transfer endocrine-disrupting chemicals from the plastic into the food. We all are very familiar with the process of putting some food in a plastic container,

putting it in a microwave; and sometimes some literature has indicated that that might migrate from the plastic into the food. This might be a problem that we should be concerned about.

Additional research is needed to understand how prevalent such endocrine-disrupting chemicals are in our daily lives and what impact they have on human health, wildlife, and the environment.

The way we go about studying this, Mr. Chairman, is not to say, as some have said in the past, that we need to throw money at this problem and we need to get every Federal agency and bureaucracy studying it differently.

It is also not, as some have indicated in the past, in the future to completely ignore this problem and to say there is no problem here, let us neglect this and see if people begin to get sick. We have said a new approach, a third way, a new idea.

We say in this amendment there is neither a conclusion that endocrine disrupters pose an imminent threat nor that there is a conclusion that the risks are insignificant or exaggerated based on the percent state of scientific knowledge. Further research is required.

Let us use the risk assessment principles that we have talked about in the last few years to better study this problem. Let us coordinate our Federal research bureaucracy and not have everybody begin to study it, but begin to concentrate a study in a few areas.

That is what this amendment does. Let us study and research on a scientific basis, using risk assessment principles in a new way, whether we do have a problem with plastic, with detergents, with pesticides; and if we can do that, we may need to come before Congress in the future and study it further.

This amendment does not require a new appropriation of money. It simply seeks to coordinate what we might be doing in the future as our budgets are declining. And as our budgets are restrained here in the U.S. Congress, let us try some new ideas to study some potentially very, very serious new problems.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the body will agree to this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment. This issue has captured the attention of the press and public in recent weeks, but in fact research in this area has been ongoing for over 15 years now. I believe the gentleman is correct in assuming that this is more than a passing fancy. The issues raised by the release of the book, "Our Stolen Future," are of concern and deserve the serious attention of this committee.

The design and implementation of a good research plan is essential to gaining sound scientific information about the nature and scope of this problem. These efforts are already underway

within the Federal Government. It is Congress that now needs to participate in these efforts. The research report required under the amendment will provide us with a solid basis to make recommendations for future authorizations that may be needed.

I want to commend the gentleman for his efforts in drafting an amendment that can be agreed to by people with varying opinions about the validity and seriousness of this issue. I have no doubt that we will have other opportunities to debate this issue before the close of this Congress. There is more that Congress could do in this area, but we should surely not do less than is provided for in this amendment. We may be asked to make tough policy choices in the future on this issue. We should make those choices from an informed position, that is what the Roemer amendment will help to ensure. I urge its adoption.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer-Boehlert amendment to require EPA to plan and coordinate endocrine disrupter research. The Committee on Science has strongly supported EPA research on endocrine disrupters, including more money in H.R. 3322 than the administration had requested. We have an \$8 million total amount in this bill, which is 10 percent above the President's request of \$7.1 million.

The Roemer-Boehlert amendment helps us, though, to define that research and will require the Environmental Protection Agency to submit to Congress a plan for conducting research needed to objectively assess and characterize the risk of endocrine disrupters.

Recent concerns have been raised about the broad array of both natural and synthetic compounds which have the capacity to mimic both human and animal hormones disrupting the body's natural state. These components, known collectively as endocrine disrupters, have been alleged to contribute to a wide variety of human and environmental maladies, including reduced sperm counts and increased instances of fetal abnormalities.

While the media has widely reported as fact the hypothesis that synthetic compounds are causing human sperm counts to decline worldwide, credible scientific research on the issue is lacking. Even the premise that sperm counts are declining remains unproven.

The amendment will go a long way toward establishing a scientifically sound research plan to address the potential impacts of endocrine disrupters. The research can then be used to do any necessary assessments of the best estimate of risk, based on the weight of the scientific evidence, and to pursue necessary cost-benefit analysis, should any regulatory mechanisms be proposed.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. I support it, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana for bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his support of this amendment, and look forward to working with the gentleman in the course of his remaining time here in Congress to see that we do come up with a new way of studying what could be a very significant problem.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

AMENDMENT NO. 2, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY  
MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment as modified, offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 87, lines 1 through 21, amend subsection (g) to read as follows:

(g) WEATHER SERVICE MODERNIZATION.—The Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(1) in section 706—

(A) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may not close, automate, or relocate any field office unless the Secretary has certified to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives that such action will not result in degradation of service to the affected area. Such certification shall be in accordance with the modernization criteria established under section 704.”;

(B) by striking subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f); and

(C) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

“(c) SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may not close or relocate any field office which is located at an airport, if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and the Committee, determines as a result of an air safety appraisal that such action will result in degradation of service that affects aircraft safety. This air safety appraisal shall be issued jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Transportation before September 30, 1996, and shall be based on a coordinated review of all the airports in the United States subject to the certification requirements of subsection (b). The appraisal shall—

“(1) consider the weather information required to safely conduct aircraft operations and the extent to which such information is currently derived through manual observations provided by the National Weather Service and the Federal Aviation Administration, and automated observations provided from other sources including the Automated Weather Observation Service (AWOS), the Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS), and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES); and

“(2) determine whether the service provided by ASOS, and ASOS augmented where necessary by human observations, provides the necessary level of service consistent with the service standards encompassed in the criteria for automation of the field offices.

“(d) PUBLIC LIAISON.—The Secretary shall maintain for a period of at least two years after the closure of any weather office a program to—

“(1) provide timely information regarding the activities of the National Weather Service which may affect service to the community, including modernization and restructuring; and

“(2) work with area weather service users, including persons associated with general aviation, civil defense, emergency preparedness, and the news media, with respect to the provision of timely weather warnings and forecasts.”; and

(2) in section 707—

(A) by amendment subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) DUTIES. The Committee shall advise the Congress and the Secretary on—

“(1) the implementation of the Strategic Plan, annual development of the Plan, and establishment and implementation of modernization criteria; and

“(2) matters of public safety and the provision of weather services relate to the comprehensive modernization of the National Weather Service.”; and

(B) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

“(f) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate—

“(1) on September 30, 1996; or

“(2) 90 days after the deadline for public comment on the modernization criteria for closure certification published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 704(b)(2), whichever occurs later.”.

Mr. CRAMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the Weather Service Modernization Act, which was passed in 1992, established procedures for the modernization of the National Weather Service. A lot of us here today, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] included, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] as well, have fought long and hard to make sure that our areas of the country were included in that modernization plan.

There were two points that we raised consistently about this modernization act. One was the requirement that no Weather Service office can be closed or automated without a certification that the closure would not result in degradation of service to the affected area.

Let me repeat that in lay language. We do not want Weather Service offices closed without a certification that there is no degradation of service there.

So as we proceed with the modernization plan, we are proceeding with a network of NEXRAD radars that will cover the entire country. A lot of us have talked about our concerns about



the NEXRAD radars, but we have not talked as much about the closure of the Weather Service offices.

Mr. Chairman, I support the modernization plan, but I think there is a balance between no certification at all, which the committee bill stands for, and a streamlined certification process.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman WALKER and the staff of the committee for working with us, those of us that are concerned, to make sure that we develop the proper balance between cost savings and the protection of our citizens, because we are talking about the protection of lives when we are talking about the closure of the Weather Service offices.

□ 1630

We need a certification process. There must be some specific accountability before we are going to say that we will not serve an area through the existing weather service office. It has taken many of us Members of Congress a few years to make sure that our areas were in fact given consideration for the modernization process. I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and I, through the committee, on the floor, as well, have fought consistently and maintained that we were in gap areas, that the modernization plan did not in fact cover our areas and that our children, our families, people in church, people in schools, people in their homes would in fact be very vulnerable.

Mr. Chairman, just this past weekend in my district we had another weather service pattern that moved in. We were glued to our TV's as we watched the NEXRAD coverage in my district from 100 miles south. We looked at the local weather service Doppler radar that we have in our area as well, all of that trying to see if we could be protected. So when we are talking about saving money, we have also got to be talking about saving lives and some built-in checks and balances in this process.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment today would accomplish a streamlining of the certification process. As I said a few minutes ago, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania Chairman WALKER, and thank him for working with us on making sure that we have at least a streamlined certification process. We will eliminate the costly and time-consuming requirement that each closing certification be published in the Federal Register for 60 days. We will eliminate by September one of the two current oversight committees involved in the process. This streamlining will save \$35 million over 5 years and will eliminate redundancies that are currently in the law.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of streamlining the modernization process, but I am not willing to sacrifice the safety of people. This is a safety issue, and I thank the chairman for accepting my committee amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER]. He and I have worked over the past 4½ years, I believe, on the committee that we serve on together to try to make sure that public safety is not compromised when an office is prematurely closed.

Let me just relate an instance of this concern to the people in this body and again salute the gentleman from Alabama for taking such a critically important lead role in this amendment. In Indiana right now, as the distinguished chairman over the whole body knows, being a Member from Indiana, we are seeing a host of tornados and floods hit our area. This is not only potentially endangering school children that may be getting on a bus to go to school for one of the last days of school in Indiana when they need not be if they had a sufficient warning out there from radar that covered our area, which the National Research Council says does not; we do not have adequate coverage in our area right now.

So school children going out to get on a school bus at 6:30 in the morning may not have to take that risk, if we got the sufficient scientific data out there and then the warning on the radio that school was closed and we had a dangerous situation, inclement weather or a tornado in the area, right now do not have that good scientific coverage.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment helps protect our existing offices from premature closure until we get the new radar and technology put up in our area. We are hopeful that this new NEXRAD radar will be located somewhere in northern Indiana, based upon science and technology and where it is going to work best, whether that is in Saint Joseph County, whether that is in Elkhart County, whether that might even be in Allen County, or south of there, to make sure that we save the taxpayer money.

As the chairman of the body knows today, too, our farmers are having a difficult time getting out in the fields to plant corn because of the weather. This technology would help us save lives from tornados and inclement weather, help us save billions of dollars in terms of the costs to farmers of trying to get good information out there before they get into the fields as to when they can get into the fields.

This amendment is not only about public safety and concern for children and money for agriculture, which is a huge cost in our economy today, it is also about streamlining a bureaucratic process, doing it the right way, doing it the way that it will save money and not compromise our schoolchildren back home in Indiana or in Alabama.

So I rise in strong support of this streamlining the bureaucracy but not compromising public safety and schoolchildren in the morning getting on a bus. I also would like to acknowledge and compliment the chairman of the

committee for his support and his staff's support, working together on this amendment, and from what I understand, their acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] will partially restore the certification process for closure of old National Weather Service offices. H.R. 3322 as presently drafted currently eliminates the certification process entirely, saving the National Weather Service \$35 million over the next 5 years. The gentleman from Alabama offered an amendment going in this same direction in the committee. We have since been able to work out some language between us. I want to thank the gentleman very much for working with us on this.

We are told now by the National Weather Service that the amendment that he has crafted results in saving a similar \$35 million over the 5-year period with a dramatically scaled-back certification process. This is the kind of streamlining that should go on within Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think between us we have come up with an acceptable solution here. It does save the taxpayer some money. It is the direction of reform that we need to be taking as a Congress and as a country. So I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment. I am delighted to support it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cramer amendment to streamline the weather office certification procedures.

I would say that these certification procedures were developed in 1992 at a time when the National Weather Service was in the early stages of a far reaching modernization program in which new technologies would be deployed and the geographic distribution of weather forecast offices would be vastly altered.

There was widespread recognition in Congress that this modernization proposal would have far reaching benefits for public safety and would also reduce the cost to the taxpayer. The issue which dominated the debate, however, was how this would affect the local communities who had come to depend on the service that the local offices were providing.

After a great deal of debate and discussion within the Science Committee, with many other Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and with Members of the other body, and with the National Weather Service, a carefully crafted compromise was developed. That compromise was included in Public Law 102-567.

Essentially, that compromise was a congressional commitment that no offices would be closed or consolidated

until there was a demonstration that there would be no degradation of service. Congress went to great lengths to ensure that the public had adequate input into this process that affected their personal lives so directly.

It is no secret that some in the OMB, the Department of Commerce Inspector General, and some Members of Congress have felt that no such commitment was necessary. This point of view has been the basis of the existing bill language that does away with the certification procedures. I would only say to them that, from my perspective, this commitment was necessary in order to gain the support of Congress to undertake the modernization program at all. I would also say that the certification procedures that we are talking about had strong bipartisan consensus. It reflected the instincts of most Members to look out for the safety and well-being of his or her constituents.

At this juncture, I am satisfied that the modernization program has been successful enough that we can consider a streamlining of the certification procedures as proposed by Mr. CRAMER. I believe that the compromise language is fair and will still provide the necessary assurances to the public and allow for adequate public input and review.

I support the Cramer amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, once again, I would like to express my strong support for Representative CRAMER's amendment to streamline the certification process for eliminating a National Weather Service office.

When the National Weather Service began developing this comprehensive modernization program, we heard a lot about the revolutionary improvements this would bring to our weather forecasting system. I don't doubt the quality of the NEXRAD system. However, I am concerned that in the rush to revamp the system, a few areas have the potential of literally falling through the cracks. In my own communications with the National Weather Service, I heard repeated justifications and explanations for those areas which are long distances between NEXRAD facilities. An independent scientific review confirmed my fears that some areas of our country will actually suffer a loss of service under NEXRAD.

Last year, the National Research Council completed its study of NEXRAD coverage and the potential for a degradation in service due to the field office consolidation. While the NRC study found NEXRAD will offer services above and beyond the current weather forecasting system, it also noted concern for areas a long distance from a proposed NEXRAD facility. One of those areas of concern is Williston, ND, whose old radar is 120 miles from the nearest NEXRAD facility.

Currently, a study is being undertaken for the Williston area to determine if a degradation of service would occur under the National Weather Service's modernization plan. Data is being collected from the existing Williston radar and the NEXRAD radars for comparison. If the certification process for office closure is eliminated, the National Weather Service could ignore the results of the study and move

forward with its original plans, even if a degradation of service is proven.

Even though the western part of my State is sparsely populated, those living there need and deserve the same quality of weather forecasting available to the rest of the country. In rural areas where long distances are often traveled as a matter of daily life, forewarning of severe weather is crucial to public safety.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Cramer amendment and make sure the National Weather Service follows a streamlined certification process for weather office closures.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to protect the lives and property of millions of Americans. High quality weather service should be a basic guarantee. Unfortunately, this guarantee is in jeopardy today as we consider a bill that would let bureaucrats close weather stations without regard for degradation of service.

Mr. Chairman, the certification requirement prevented the closure of the critical weather station in Key West. As the National Weather Service considered closing the facility last year, they were required to evaluate how they could serve the 80,000 residents and visitors of the Keys who live on 43 islands across a 120-mile stretch. The people of the Keys were grateful that the National Weather Service had to consider their unique situation. Without the certification requirement, the National Weather Service would have made a grave mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I thought we resolved this issue last year when we debated the exact same issue. Unfortunately, we did not. Congress should not cut corners when it comes to basic public safety, and I thank the Chairman for accepting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LOFGREN: Page 7, line 6, strike "\$120,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$129,100,000".

Page 7, lines 9 through 16, strike subsection (c).

Page 19, lines 13 through 23, amend section 130 to read as follows:

#### SEC. 130. REORGANIZATION.

(a) PLAN.—The Director shall carry out a review and analysis of the organizational structure of the National Science Foundation for the purpose of developing a plan for reorganization that will result in reduced administrative costs, while maintaining the quality and effectiveness of the Foundation's programs. The plan shall include one or more options for reorganization of the Foundation, and one option shall be an organizational structure having fewer than 7 directorates.

(b) REPORT.—By February 15, 1997, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a re-

port containing the plan required by subsection (a). The report shall document the advantages and disadvantages of each option included in the plan, provide an estimate of cost savings for each option, and designate the Director's preferred option.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment corrects two provisions in the bill that will impede the internal operation of the National Science Foundation. First of all, the amendment restores funding for NSF salaries and administrative expenses to the President's request level in order to avoid ill-considered staff reductions.

Second, it removes provisions which together eliminate funding for one of NSF's directorates and which would trigger perhaps inadvertently a reorganization of NSF's administrative structure.

NSF is not a bloated bureaucracy. Between fiscal years 1983 and 1993, NSF's full-time staff positions remained constant while its budget nearly tripled and the workload measured by numbers of proposals processed more than doubled. In the current fiscal year, the cost of operating NSF is 4 percent of the total budget, which is a modest and reasonable level of administrative overhead. Due to the dedication of its workers and investments in infrastructure, NSF has improved its efficiency, resulting in increased productivity.

H.R. 3322 proposes to cut the budget for salaries and administrative expenses by more than \$7 million below the current fiscal year budget and 9 million below the request. NSF has determined that after taking into account fixed costs for rent and utilities, such a cut would translate into a reduction of 120 people, assuming the average compensation level across the agency.

The science and engineering staff comprises about one-third of total personnel and one-half of the total payroll. NSF estimates that a budget cut of this magnitude will result in layoff of scientific and engineering personnel, the people who run the research programs, and would degrade the efficiency of operations. Moreover, this cut would result in a reduction of one to \$2 million in the computer networking investment NSF is now making to streamline internal operations and improve communications with the university research community.

These investments have been the basis of past productivity improvements and have helped NSF to meet the growing workload demands while avoiding staff increases. The net result of the cuts proposed by H.R. 3322 would be to impede virtually all business operations of NSF from disbursement of payments to university researchers throughout the Nation to the timing and quality of research award decisions. My amendment restores funding to a reasonable level for the internal operations of this already slimmed-down agency.

In addition, my amendment removes the provisions of the bill that eliminate one NSF directorate. These provisions do raise a reasonable issue. That is what approaches can the agency take to further streamline its organization and reduce administrative expenses. Ideally, organizational changes will be found which will both reduce costs and improve the efficiency of the agency's operations.

Mr. Chairman, my objection to H.R. 3322 is that it presumes that the way to achieve such improvements is through elimination of one of the agency's directorates. It may be that such a course of action is the best approach, but we cannot make that judgment in the absence of evidence. This Congress should not be making an arbitrary determination. No hearings have been held by the Committee on Science on this matter. NSF has developed no plan for reorganization that lays out the advantages nor provides an estimate of cost savings of such a change.

I would also point out that section 111C of the bill on the one hand bans use of fiscal year 1997 funding to more than six directorates while section 130 specifies that the agency has until November 15, 1½ months into the new fiscal year, to present a reorganization plan to Congress. This again suggests the agency is being forced into significant change prior to developing a realignment plan and that congressionally mandated cuts have more to do with our belief system and politics than with streamlining.

Rather than impose a congressional mandate for a specific organizational change in NSF, it seems to me it would be more reasonable to mandate a thorough review of the operation with an accompanying plan to achieve administrative cost reductions and improve efficiency of operations. With such a plan in hand, the committee would be in a position to mandate useful changes. My amendment strikes the prohibition in fiscal year 1997 funding for more than six directorates, strikes the limitation of six assistant directors, imposes a requirement for NSF to submit by February 15, 1997, a reorganization plan with several options to improve operational effectiveness and to reduce administrative costs.

My amendment stipulates that NSF evaluate as part of the plan the elimination of one directorate. The Congress will have time to consider the NSF recommendations through the hearing process prior to consideration of fiscal year 1998 authorization legislation. By following this procedure, we would be able to make an informed decision on necessary legislation. I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, Ms. LOFGREN. I object to the amendment because, first of all, the

majority in presenting this bill, H.R. 3322, has tried to put all of the money it possibly can into the research and related activities account and other accounts that actually go to grants for research, which is the major function of the National Science Foundation.

We do not believe it is unreasonable to ask the National Science Foundation to help cooperate with us in terms of establishing this priority in getting the money out for research grants by tightening their belt somewhat in the area of their administrative overhead. In that regard, we have proposed a reduction in the salaries and expenses, as correctly identified by my colleague, from the current funding of \$127 million a year for salaries and expenses to \$120 million a year. That is a \$7 million reduction.

□ 1645

And we believe although the NSF will have to make some difficult choices, as other agencies have made difficult choices, as this Congress made difficult choices when we reduced the number of committees in the U.S. House of Representatives for the first time in my memory and, I think, virtually anyone's memory in the House of Representatives.

Now, we think the National Science Foundation should be willing to undergo that same prioritization and decisionmaking, but there is another reason why I oppose the Lofgren amendment, and that is the gentlewoman from California says that we should adopt the President's budget on the salaries and expense account, and indeed the President's budget would go up from this year, fiscal year 1996, to next year, fiscal year 1997, in the salaries and expense account for the National Science Foundation. It would go up.

Here is fiscal year 1996 right now showing the \$127 million per year amount funded for this account. Here is the proposed budget in H.R. 3322. It goes down in the next fiscal year, but it does not go down after that. It stays level for each of the next 4 fiscal years all the way to fiscal year, to and including fiscal year, 2000. We proposed that it stay at an annual appropriation of \$120 million.

It is not true of the President's budget. The President's budget goes up in this account in fiscal year 1997, but what happens after that? It drops precipitously. It drops immediately below the \$120 million that has been authorized in H.R. 3322. It drops in the next fiscal year to \$118 million. It drops in the next fiscal year to \$107 million. It drops again in the next year to \$101 million. Now I wonder what the effects on the National Science Foundation will be if those cuts take effect?

We are proposing a one-time reduction and then a stabilization. The administration is proposing a raise and then a big drop. What would be the same effect as outlined by the previous speaker if that bigger drop occurs than we are recommending?

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that what is reflected here, the comparison of budgets, is what I have seen in many accounts. The fact of the matter is this diagram, although it is one account of one agency, it is the salaries account of the National Science Foundation, this account illustrates almost every comparison I have seen between the congressional proposed budget and the administration's budget. They propose increases in fiscal year 1997. Well, we vote on fiscal 1997 this year in calendar year 1996. That is a Presidential election year, and so there is a proposed artificial boost for 1 year and then a big drop after that.

And I want to say I have numerous constituent groups who rely upon appropriations and grants from the Federal Government who are handed material from the administration, and they bring it over to my office, and I am sure my colleagues from both parties have seen this, and they say, "I'd like you to support the President's request for fiscal year 1997 for the agency in which we have an interest."

And I say to them, "Well, if I do, what is the administration's request for the agency you're interested in in fiscal year 1998, 1999 and so forth, down to the year 2002, since both sides have agreed we are going to attempt to balance the budget by that year," and frankly I get a blank stare most of the time.

Well, we do not know that the administration is proposing for our agency. Well, I suggest that all people interested in Federal appropriations better find out, because this is an artificial election year bump, and after that, to make the books balance, there is a big drop, far worse than anything that is proposed by the Congress in my estimation.

The point is both sides have now agreed publicly that we will attempt to balance the budget in 7 years, by fiscal year 2002. This chart only goes to fiscal year 2000, so there is even two more years not illustrated here in the chart before us.

With that in mind, I think that what the committee here proposes in H.R. 3322 is reasonable and should be adopted and the amendment rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my colleague's amendment, and I want to make a few points. I do believe that H.R. 3322 just goes too far with regard to the National Science Foundation. Let us remember this is one of the most efficient Federal agencies. Less than 4 percent of its budget supports its own internal operations. In the past decade its budget has tripled, the workload has doubled, but yet the work force has remained constant. So I think the gentlewoman's amendment has focused on a problem in NSF that H.R. 3322 does not in fact address, and so consequently I support this amendment and urge my colleague to do the same.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to further add that in the discussion had by my well-respected colleague from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], I think it is really a diversion from the issue before us. The funding actually authorized for NSF's internal operation for 1997 is what is before us, and differences in funding projections for the NSF beyond 1997 in the President's balanced budget plan versus the Gingrich budget plan really are not particularly relevant to this discussion. The outyear budget estimates for individual agencies, let alone specific budget categories such as the salaries and expense account of NSF, are not cast in stone by the proposed funding envelope of the President's budget plan any more than they are by the Republican budget resolution.

For example, last year's House budget resolution assumed a total funding level of \$3.17 billion for NSF for fiscal year 1997, which is \$120 million, or 4 percent, below the estimate for fiscal year 1997 in this year's budget resolution. Also, we are assured in this year's budget resolution that \$120 million for NSF salary and expense account for 1997, it will be followed by an equal amount in the next 5 years. However, last year's budget resolution assumed this account would decline by \$5 million.

The point is that the additional years will be subject to additional authorization and appropriation, and these are made on a year-by-year basis. The budget estimates for NSF beyond 1997 are not relevant to this year's authorization, and I would just make this point: I know that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] supports NSF, as do I. I know that he believes in their research, as do I, and respects the organization. But if we allow them to be reduced so far administratively that they cannot adequately review the grants and get the funding out to our fine universities, we will have hobbled really something that is a star in our country, and I know that my colleague agrees that the NSF is a star in our country.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to briefly point out that H.R. 3322 will eliminate one NSF directorate, and yet we do not know the effect of that on the agency. So I think we are imposing an organizational change on that agency before we hear from that agency, and this agency is too efficient to treat that way, and so I applaud the gentlewoman for accomplishing that through her amendment as well.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to strongly support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] and as a matter of fact have included similar provisions in the sub-

stitute which I will offer at the appropriate time. It seems to be highly unwise to take an agency, which all of us recognize the value of, it is very high on the priorities of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and other Members of the majority. There is no criticism that it is engaged in waste, fraud, or abuse. It has a very lean organization and one which works extremely effectively in moving grants out to the best researchers in this country on the basis of thoroughly peer-reviewed applications for these grants.

So I think it smacks of being punitive to arbitrarily cut even a small figure like \$7 million, which is only about 6 percent of their budget, for this particular category of activities. It smacks of a certain degree of punitiveness to seek to do this particularly when we have had no hearings on the need for it, we have not asked the agency in for comments on it, we have not asked the research community for their views on it. We are merely told repeatedly, over and over again, that we have to engage in belt tightening, we have to make tough choices, we have to be willing to accept a little pain. Of course, what is not mentioned here is that this suffering, belt tightening, and pain is aimed at securing a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, nobody is arguing about a balanced budget. The President's budget is in balance, or close to in balance. The budgets which I have consistently supported in prior years, including last year, were in balance. The argument is not over the question of balancing the budget, and \$7 million is not going to balance the budget particularly. It is over how we get to the balanced budget.

Now, obviously, there is some objection to the fact that in the President's budget he does not have these cuts, but that there are cuts later on down the road. This is a question of judgment. It is in the eyes of the majority, this is a flagrant example of trying to buy the election by keeping up another \$7 million for personnel over at NSF. I doubt very seriously if \$7 million going to the personnel over at NSF is going to buy the election for anybody. I think it is a reflection of the President's commitment to science and trying to keep the funding for the most respected scientific program this country has at a more equitable level, not to make drastic cuts in it, and I think that this is why we should adopt the gentlewoman's amendment.

Now, what really is happening here is that there is a difference in values. I do not mean to berate this. The gentlemen on the other side who are willing to cut \$7 million out of NSF are willing to add \$13 billion to the Defense Department budget, or whatever the appropriate number is. Frankly, because in their view, the views of the majority, or most of the majority; I will not characterize all of them; it is more important to exceed the President's bud-

et by \$12 or \$13 billion than it is to maintain the level of support for our basic research in this country, and if our colleagues have that sort of values, fine, but do not disguise the argument by saying that they are trying to balance the budget. Both budgets are balanced. They are trying to cut programs in order to add money to the Defense Department or other programs that they favor.

That is the honest to God truth as to what is going on here, and it will recur in many debates as they attack the President's budget for whatever reasons they can think of and then proceed to go ahead and propose additions to it for those programs that they happen to like. So let us be honest about this. Let us adopt the amendment of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] and protect this most important program that we have for the support of science in this country.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment to debate because I think it does draw the contrasts between where the two parties are coming from on some of these issues.

First of all, this is about bureaucracy. This is whether or not we are going to reform the bureaucracies of Washington in order to give more money to the country.

Now, we give more money to the country in a variety of forms. We have chosen, in the case of NSF, to give more money in terms of actual research, and I will show a chart here in a moment that indicates that. That is where we have put our issue. In other words, get the moneys out to the universities, get them out to the people out in the country, and so on, rather than do it with bureaucracy in Washington.

Second, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] talks about the fact that the balanced budgets are similar. As my colleagues know, the balanced budgets are not at all similar. We include in our balanced budget a tax cut for middle-class America. Their budgets do not include tax cuts, and so indeed we have to cut more in spending because we intend to cut taxes for middle-class working families in this country.

□ 1700

So the fact is that they want to continue to spend, spend, spend, keep the taxes high and spend people's money here in Washington for more and more bureaucracy. We have specifically said that we want to do something different. We want to balance the budget while cutting the taxes for middle-class working families. So our budgets do reflect a desire to reduce bureaucracy so tax cuts can be given to middle-class working families in this country.

That is what we are talking about here, whether or not we actually want

to begin the process of cutting bureaucracy, or whether or not we want to play a shell game in terms of budgets, as is suggested on the chart shown by the gentleman from New Mexico. What we have is a shell game here. They raise the budget for personnel and for bureaucracy in the first year, and then all of a sudden they drop it way off.

We actually asked the question of NSF: If you go along with what the President has requested in his budget, which these 1997 numbers supposedly endorse, how many full-time Federal employees could we lose by 1998 when the account goes down not to \$120 million that we are talking about, but down to \$118 million? And then how many more employees do we lose when, under the President's numbers, we go to \$107 million? Or how many more do we lose when we go to \$101 million? That is what the President's budget does.

Guess what? Having asked that question of the NSF, the letter got hung up in OMB. NSF wanted to reply to us, but somewhere down in OMB they do not want us to know the answer to that particular question, because the fact is the answer to that question will probably reveal exactly the shell game going on here.

If we are going to be cutting money for bureaucracy, should we be putting the money into some real research? We cut the money for bureaucracy and then flatten the line into the outyears under a balanced budget over 7 years. What does the administration do? The administration, not according to me but according to the AAAS, whose studies on academic science were widely touted on this floor last year, they took a look at the NSF budgets. What did they find? The red line is the President's budget. They find that the President's budget for NSF goes out here fairly flat for a couple of years and then drops off terrifically, while they also find that the House-passed budget continues to climb in the outyears. We take money out of bureaucracy and put it into real science. The President in those outyears takes it out of bureaucracy, but takes it out of research too. Everything drops and the entire enterprise is left with no support and, in this case, no science.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, that is a bad deal. It seems to me that what we want to do is reject the gentlewoman's amendment that suggests that more money for bureaucrats is what we need in Washington. We think it is time for reform in Washington. Let us eliminate the bureaucracy.

We have been criticized because in our report language we say that one of the directorates should be cut as a way of eliminating the program. The fact is that there are a number of options available to the NSF that the minority does not seem to recognize. For example, the minority, in saying that 120 positions would have to be cut, ignores the fact that one of the things we

might be able to do is to reduce travel budgets at NSF, or we might be able to reduce administrative overhead expenses. There are all kinds of ways we could lower this account.

They simply assume that what NSF would do is fire people. That is what their numbers do. I do not necessarily think that that is the way NSF would deal with this. We think one of the ways we can reduce some of that administrative overhead is by reducing the number of directorates. We suggest they reduce it by one. Mr. Chairman, in our report we suggest a specific directorate because that was the most recent one adopted. It is also one where the science was spread out through the agency before, and now we are reducing a directorate. Perhaps that is the way to go.

But it is up to NSF. It is up to the director. How does he want to reduce this money, is what we are saying. We are going to give them discretion. But we do want to eliminate the spending. We do want to bring it down and then keep it in a flat line, as this chart represents.

The administration has a shell game going here: Increase it, as the gentlewoman suggests, and then drop it like a rock, so we do not have the kind of support that the agency needs in the outyear. I do not think that is a good deal. I suggest we vote with the committee's position. Keep the money out of bureaucracy, put it toward real science, reject the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I just wanted to make a few brief comments on the amendment and what we are talking about here.

We are talking about a reduction in this year's funding for staffing the NSF. I am a new Member of Congress. I have been here only about 18 months, but I have yet to hear in my 18 months in Congress any hint from any Member of this body that this is a highly politicized organization.

In fact, quite to the contrary, I have heard from both sides of the aisle a great deal of comment about the excellent work done through the auspices of the NSF, the fine science they have produced. So I have a sense that this is a good organization and that we ought to listen to the director of the organization. So I would like to quote the director, Neal Lane, who has commented on the bill, and which I think my amendment speaks to.

He says that he is very disappointed with the proposed reduction, and says, "Our analysis of the committee's reduction in this area shows that it

would require the elimination of 120 FTE's, roughly 10 percent of our work force—in 1 year." He goes on to say that:

A reduction of this kind would demoralize our highly talented and dedicated work force. If we fail to provide sufficient resources to adequately staff and support NSF, the result will be less coordination, less oversight, less efficiency, and a real degradation in the integrity of the merit review process and the quality of our programs and operations.

This is a lot of money where I come from, \$7 million, but I also think it needs to be put in the broader context of the overall budget for science and the overall budget for the Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be pennywise and pound foolish to make a reduction of 10 percent of the scientists in NSF, as the director suggests would be the result, that would preclude them from adequately managing the remainder of the budget that we are providing for in the budget, and augmented, I might add, by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

This is not a question of bureaucracy, it is about good management, in making sure that the resources that we are investing in science are wisely managed and prudently overseen and that there is a good interface between our higher education community and the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking at some length on this because I think we know that failure to adequately invest in science is really a blow to our future. Although there may be sit-ins or demonstrators talking about the National Science Foundation, it may not be on the talk radio, really, the constituency for investment in science is the next generation. Failure to do the prudent thing in this regard is really a failure for the next generation, my children and others in their age bracket. The 10- and 11- and 12-year-olds will be reaping the problems that we sow here through a misstep.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the gentlewoman's explanation. Again, she makes the point that they fundamentally believe on the minority side that if in fact we can concentrate power in Washington and if in fact we can put power into the hands of bureaucrats, that, in fact, the country will be made better; that somehow, science and research will be expanded by having \$9 million more or \$7 million more spent for more bureaucrats. That is precisely what we disagree with.

Neal Lane's letter, and I have it before me here, does not suggest they are

going to cut scientists. He suggested they would eliminate 120 FTE's, roughly 10 percent of the work force. That is not just scientists, that is all kinds of people that might be employed at the Science Foundation.

As I said before, the question here is why did they choose to only deal with the work force? No wonder morale would be low at the National Science Foundation. When a cut is suggested, what the National Science Foundation says immediately is let us cut employees. The fact is he could cut travel budgets, he could cut administrative overhead, he could cut all kinds of things. Instead, he chooses in his letter to suggest that the only place, the only place they are prepared to make cuts is to take it out of the hide of their work force. No wonder they have low morale over there. No wonder the situation is so bad.

That is the reason why, in my view, we need to have this cut. We need to get that in a stable position so it can in fact operate within a balanced budget for the next several years, and do so in a way which equitably treats the science community while increasing the amount actually spent for science and getting it out to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a bad amendment. It does in fact increase spending. It should be rejected.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to add another point of view. That is, again, to the fact that the President's budget, and that is what we are being offered here, we are being offered the President's budget for fiscal year 1997, and although it goes up in fiscal year 1997, it goes down each fiscal year after that. In fiscal year 1998, only in the next year, at \$118 million, the same account we are talking about will be \$2 million less than the Republican proposal on the floor today. The administration's proposal keeps going down every year after that.

The point is, even from the point of view being expressed by the gentleman offering the amendment, the \$120 million funding every year that remains stable will be better for the National Science Foundation than the administration's budget. I recognize the gentleman stated that, well, budgets in future years are not in concrete. But they are becoming made in concrete. That is because both sides, the administration and the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, have agreed to a common goal of balancing the budget by fiscal year 2002.

Therefore, if we are going to adopt a House Republican budget or a House Democratic budget, or in this case, the proposal for the administration's budget, we have to understand what all of the years mean, because the books have to balance somewhere. If the ad-

ministration in this election year is going to propose an increase in any account, then they have to make the books balance somewhere. They do it by taking the money away in the larger dimension in future years.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this opportunity, despite the fact that I have spoken before, because I am beginning to see the beginnings of an outline of what the real differences are here. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the distinguished chairman of the committee, has sought to put it in terms of a difference between eliminating the bureaucrats and sending the money out to the people. That is one way to phrase it.

I had earlier indicated that I felt that the people on the majority side were willing to cut the program at NASA, at NSF and at NASA also, as far as that is concerned, so they could spend more money on defense. The gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], has correctly pointed out that that is not exactly all they want to do. They also want to propose a very substantial tax cut for what he calls the middle class, which, as I understand it, is basically those who earn \$200,000 a year or more.

Mr. Chairman, we could go even further in clarifying this difference in philosophy. We could point out also that it is necessary in the Republican budget that they generate a few more cuts in order that they can also take care of not only the tax cut for the rich middle class and for the military, but they also think that it is necessary to reduce the rate of growth in benefits for welfare, for Medicaid, people on Social Security and so forth.

What we are seeing emerge here is a classic difference in philosophy between the Democrats and the Republicans. There is some overlap, of course. There are Members on the Republican side who do not always agree with the priorities that the majority over there have. As I read in the paper, some of these differences are becoming fairly overt at this point. Not all democrats agree to the same concepts, what I have described as the democratic core values that the President has tried to enunciate, and which I occasionally try to enunciate. But I think it is fairly clear that the majority, in this bill, are trying to pile up cuts which can be used to offset some of these other core values that they have: a bigger military, more tax cuts for the wealthy, and so forth.

□ 1715

Recognizing as I say this that this will probably polarize the debate and

bring every loyal Republican to the floor to vote against this amendment, I want to see that happen, because I want to see these core values clearly set forth and voted for in a way that will be clear to all the American people.

I may be totally wrong and the American people are going to say, "George, Bob Walker correctly described you as a bureaucrat-loving, tax-and-spend liberal," and they are going to vote against me. But I want them to have the chance to see this laid out so that we will know what it is that we are voting for, and it is with this point in mind that I am supporting this amendment which protects a program which we all agree is a valuable program but it is run by bureaucrats, I do not know who else could run it, and so we are going to cut the bureaucrats out.

I hope that the amendment will pass. If it does not pass, I hope everybody will be on record as to which side that they are on.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, the National Science Foundation employs almost exactly the same number of people in 1994 as it did in 1984, that despite a 2.5 times increase in the amount of work that they have had to do. So I do not think it is correct to say that we want to build an empire.

In fact, this is an agency that cut its overhead and staff from 6 to 3.9 percent between 1982 and today. It is a reducing agency. It is an agency that is becoming more efficient, but it takes some staff to administer the program. I think we all agree that it has been administered efficiently and well and to the benefit of our Nation and to the scientific future of our country. I ask that the amendment be supported.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would just like to say, in response to the ranking minority member's comments, the tax reductions that we were trying to get through the House last year, which I think were vitally needed, provided tax cuts to families with children. The data on this is very clear. Young families trying to raise kids today now send a quarter of their income to Washington, DC, whereas 40 years ago they sent about 5 percent. It is many of those young families that are under the most stress.

We also had a capital gains relief package that was going to provide very, very badly needed jobs in my district, which has been hard hit by defense cuts as well as 2,000 jobs that were eliminated at Kennedy Space Center between 1990 and 1994 when about \$1 billion was taken out of the shuttle program. So I think the Republican budget priorities are sound priorities.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to emphasize the point the gentleman is making. Every high technology entrepreneur that I have talked to has told me that one of the fundamental things that we should do for high technology in this country is cut the capital gains taxes. They need long-term risk investment in high technology industries in this country, and so therefore the capital gains tax cut that we have proposed is in fact one of the best things we can do for science and technology in this country, if we believe in the entrepreneurial spirit that is going to drive that technology.

Second, the gentleman is absolutely correct. We are not talking about \$200,000 a year families. If anybody had bothered to read the budget that we passed in the House the other day, it went to families who made less than \$100,000 a year. That is where the money is going. Those are middle-class Americans out there who are in fact the people who would benefit the most from the tax cut that we have.

So yes, indeed we want to cut taxes as a part of reforming Government, but fundamental to this amendment is, this amendment is about bureaucracy. The President increases bureaucracy for 1 year, but then if all the things the other side is saying are true about the need for these people in the agency, the fact is that by the next year his numbers are lower than our numbers. So what will people come back and do next year? Say, "Well, the President is wrong now. Now we need to increase it."

How do we get to a balanced budget if all we are doing is increasing spending? The fact is the President's numbers only get to balance because he is willing to make massive cuts in the out years in discretionary spending. That is what the other side will not acknowledge.

The fact is on this floor we ought to acknowledge the realities of the situation. We ought not put up with shell game budgets. We ought to be willing to say that if something has to last for 7 years, we ought to have a plan for it going 7 years, not the kind of thing that shows up in the President's budget where we increase things in the election year and then drop them off a cliff in the years afterwards.

That would be extremely damaging to NSF. That is what is being proposed by this amendment, and I think that it should be rejected out of hand.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LOFGREN].

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 8.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE  
OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. BROWN of California:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Science and Technology Investment Act of 1996".

#### TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

##### SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation \$3,325,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, which shall be available for the following categories:

(1) Research and Related Activities, \$2,472,000,000, which shall be available for the following subcategories:

(A) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, \$708,000,000.

(B) Engineering, \$354,300,000.

(C) Biological Sciences, \$326,000,000.

(D) Geosciences, \$454,000,000.

(E) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, \$277,000,000.

(F) Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, \$124,000,000.

(G) United States Polar Research Programs, \$163,400,000.

(H) United States Antarctic Logistical Support Activities, \$62,600,000.

(I) Critical Technologies Institute, \$2,700,000.

(2) Education and Human Resources Activities, \$619,000,000.

(3) Major Research Equipment, \$95,000,000.

(4) Salaries and Expenses, \$129,100,000.

(5) Office of Inspector General, \$4,700,000.

(6) Headquarters Relocation, \$5,200,000.

#### TITLE II—NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

##### SEC. 201. FISCAL YEAR 1997 AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1997 the following amounts:

(1) For "Human Space Flight" for the following programs:

(A) Space Station, \$1,802,000,000.

(B) United States/Russian Cooperation, \$138,200,000.

(C) Space Shuttle, \$3,150,900,000, including for Construction of Facilities relating to the following programs:

(i) Replacement of LC-39 Pad B Chillers (KSC), \$1,800,000.

(ii) Restoration of Pad B Fixed Support Structure Elevator System (KSC), \$1,500,000.

(iii) Rehabilitation of 480V Electrical Distribution System, Kennedy Space Center, External Tank Manufacturing Building (MAF), \$2,500,000.

(iv) Restoration of High Pressure Industrial Water Plant, Stennis Space Center, \$2,500,000.

(D) Payload and Utilization Operations, \$271,800,000.

(2) For "Science, Aeronautics, and Technology" for the following programs:

(A) Space Science, \$1,857,300,000.

(B) Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, \$498,500,000.

(C) Mission to Planet Earth, \$1,402,100,000.

(D) Aeronautical Research and Technology, \$857,800,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be for the identification and upgrading of national dual-use airbreathing propulsion aeronautical test facilities.

(E) Space Access and Technology, \$725,000,000.

(F) Academic Programs, \$100,800,000.

(G) Mission Communication Services, \$420,600,000.

(3) For "Mission Support" for the following programs:

(A) Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance, \$36,700,000.

(B) Space Communication Services, \$291,400,000.

(C) Construction of Facilities, including land acquisition, including the following:

(i) Modernization of Electrical Distribution System, Ames Research Center, \$2,400,000.

(ii) Modification of Aircraft Ramp and Tow Way, Dryden Flight Research Center, \$3,000,000.

(iii) Restoration of Hangar Building 4801, Dryden Flight Research Center, \$4,500,000.

(iv) Modernization of Secondary Electrical Systems, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$1,500,000.

(v) Restoration of Chilled Water Distribution System, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$4,000,000.

(vi) Modification of Refrigeration Systems, Various Buildings, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$2,800,000.

(vii) Rehabilitation of Electrical Distribution System, White Sands Test Facility, Johnson Space Center, \$2,600,000.

(viii) Rehabilitation of Utility Tunnel Structure and System, Johnson Space Center, \$4,400,000.

(ix) Replacement of DX Units with Central Chilled Water System, Logistics Facility, Kennedy Space Center, \$1,800,000.

(x) Rehabilitation of Central Air Equipment Building, Lewis Research Center, \$6,500,000.

(xi) Modification of Chilled Water System, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$6,700,000.

(xii) Rehabilitation of Condenser Water System, 202/207 Complex (MAF), \$2,100,000.

(xiii) Minor Revitalization of Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of \$1,500,000 per project, \$57,900,000.

(xiv) Minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$1,500,000 per project, \$3,400,000.

(xv) Facility planning and design, not otherwise provided for, \$18,700,000.

(xvi) Environmental compliance and restoration, \$33,000,000.

(D) Research and Program Management, \$2,078,800,000.

(4) For "Inspector General", \$17,000,000.

##### SEC. 202. NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958 AMENDMENT.

Section 102(d)(1) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451(d)(1)) is amended by inserting "and its climate and environment," after "knowledge of the Earth".

#### TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

##### SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Energy Research and Development Act of 1996".

##### SEC. 302. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) Federal support of research and development in general, and energy research and

development in particular, has played a key role in the growth of the United States economy since World War II through the production of new knowledge, the development of new technologies and processes, and the demonstration of such new technologies and processes for application to industrial and other uses;

(2) Federal support of energy research and development is especially important because such research and development contributes to solutions for national problems in energy security, environmental protection, and economic competitiveness;

(3) the Department of Energy has successfully promoted new technologies and processes to address problems with energy supply, fossil energy, and energy conservation through its various research and development programs;

(4) while the Federal budget deficit and payments on the national debt must be addressed through cost-cutting measures, investments in research and development on key energy issues must be maintained;

(5) within the last two years, the Department of Energy has made great strides in managing its programs more efficiently and effectively;

(6) significant savings should result from these measures without hampering the Department's core missions; and

(7) the Strategic Realignment Initiative and other such efforts of the Department should be continued.

#### SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term "Department" means the Department of Energy; and

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

#### SEC. 304. ENERGY CONSERVATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for energy conservation research, development, and demonstration—

(1) \$99,721,000 for energy conservation in building technology, State, and community sector-nongrant;

(2) \$159,434,000 for energy conservation in the industry sector;

(3) \$221,308,000 for energy conservation in the transportation sector; and

(4) \$28,350,000 for policy and management activities.

#### SEC. 305. FOSSIL ENERGY.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for fossil energy research, development, and demonstration—

(1) \$102,629,000 for coal;

(2) \$52,537,000 for petroleum;

(3) \$103,708,000 for gas;

(4) \$4,000,000 for the Fossil Energy Cooperative Research and Development Program;

(5) \$2,188,000 for fuel conversion, natural gas, and electricity;

(6) \$60,115,000 for program direction and management;

(7) \$3,304,000 for plant and capital improvements;

(8) \$15,027,000 for environmental restoration; and

(9) \$5,000,000 for mining.

#### SEC. 306. HIGH ENERGY AND NUCLEAR PHYSICS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for high energy and nuclear physics activities of the Department—

(1) \$679,125,000 for high energy physics activities;

(2) \$318,425,000 for nuclear physics activities; and

(3) \$11,600,000 for program direction.

#### SEC. 307. SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for solar

and renewable energy research, development, and demonstration—

(1) \$263,282,000 for solar energy;

(2) \$35,600,000 for geothermal energy;

(3) \$11,012,000 for hydrogen energy;

(4) \$17,301,000 for policy and management;

(5) \$36,050,000 for electric energy systems and storage; and

(6) \$5,700,000 for in-house energy management.

#### SEC. 308. NUCLEAR ENERGY.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for nuclear energy research, development, and demonstration—

(1) \$137,750,000 for nuclear energy, including \$40,000,000 for the Advanced Light Water Reactor program;

(2) \$79,100,000 for the termination of certain facilities;

(3) \$12,704,000 for isotope support; and

(4) \$18,500,000 for program direction.

#### SEC. 309. ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for research, development, and demonstration—

(1) \$73,160,000 for the Office of Environmental Safety and Health; and

(2) \$39,046,000 for program direction.

#### SEC. 310. ENERGY RESEARCH DIRECTORATE.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997—

(1) \$379,075,000 for biological and environmental research activities;

(2) \$255,600,000 for fusion energy research, development, and demonstration;

(3) \$653,675,000 for basic energy sciences activities, of which \$1,000,000 shall be for planning activities for neutron source upgrades; and

(4) \$158,143,000 for computational and technology research.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Before May 1, 1997, the Secretary, after consultation with the relevant scientific communities, shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a report detailing a strategic plan for the operation of facilities that are provided funds authorized by subsection (a)(3). The report shall include—

(1) a list of such facilities, including schedules for continuation, upgrade, transfer, or closure of each facility;

(2) a list of proposed facilities to be provided funds authorized by subsection (a)(3), including schedules for the construction and operation of each facility;

(3) a list of research opportunities to be pursued, including both ongoing and proposed activities, by the research activities authorized by subsection (a)(3); and

(4) an analysis of the relevance of each facility listed in paragraphs (1) and (2) to the research opportunities listed in paragraph (3).

#### SEC. 311. SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1997 for support programs for Energy Supply Research and Development—

(1) \$2,000,000 for Energy Research Analyses;

(2) \$28,885,000 for the Multi-Program Energy Laboratory program;

(3) \$14,900,000 for the Information Management Investment program;

(4) \$42,154,000 for program direction;

(5) \$19,900,000 for University and Science Education programs;

(6) \$12,000,000 for the Technology Information Management Program; and

(7) \$651,414,000 for Civilian Environmental Restoration and Waste Management.

### TITLE IV—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

#### SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1996".

#### SEC. 402. POLICY AND PURPOSE.

It is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this title to—

(1) support and promote continuing the mission of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to monitor, describe and predict changes in the Earth's environment, protect lives and property, and conserve and manage the Nation's coastal and marine resources to ensure sustainable economic opportunities;

(2) affirm that such mission involves basic responsibilities of the Federal Government for ensuring general public safety, national security, and environmental well-being, and promising economic growth;

(3) affirm that the successful execution of such mission depends strongly on interdependency and synergism among component activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(4) recognize that the activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration underlie the societal and economic well-being of many sectors of our Nation; and

(5) recognize that such mission is most effectively performed by a single Federal agency with the capability to link societal and economic decisions with a comprehensive understanding of the Earth's environment, as provided for in this title.

#### SEC. 403. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the operations and research activities of the National Weather Service \$471,702,000 for fiscal year 1997.

#### SEC. 404. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE SYSTEMS ACQUISITION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to improve its public warning and forecast systems \$68,984,000 for fiscal year 1997. None of the funds authorized under this section may be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under section 102(b) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567).

(b) AWIPS COMPLETE PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for all fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, an aggregate of \$271,166,000, to remain available until expended, to complete the acquisition and deployment of the Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System and NOAA Port and to cover all associated activities, including program management and operations and maintenance through September 30, 1999.

(2) No funds are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year under paragraph (1) unless, within 60 days after the submission of the President's budget request for such fiscal year, the Secretary—

(A) certifies to the Congress that—

(i) the systems meet the technical performance specifications included in the system contract as in effect on August 11, 1995;

(ii) the systems can be fully deployed, sited, and operational without requiring further appropriations beyond amounts authorized under paragraph (1); and

(iii) the Secretary does not foresee any delays in the systems deployment and operations schedule; or

(B) submits to the Congress a report which describes—

(i) the circumstances which prevent a certification under subparagraph (A);

(ii) remedial actions undertaken or to be undertaken with respect to such circumstances;

(iii) the effects of such circumstances on the systems deployment and operations schedule and systems coverage; and

(iv) a justification for proceeding with the program, if appropriate.

(C) REPEAL.—Section 102(b)(2) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 is repealed.

#### SEC. 405. WEATHER SERVICE MODERNIZATION.

(A) WEATHER SERVICE MODERNIZATION.—The Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(1) in section 706—

(A) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may not close, consolidate, automate, or relocate any field office unless the Secretary has certified to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives that such action will not result in degradation of services to the affected area. Such certification shall be in accordance with the modernization criteria established under section 704.”;

(B) by striking subsections (c), (d), and (e);

(C) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (d); and

(D) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may not close or relocate any field office which is located at an airport, unless the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and the Committee, first conducts an air safety appraisal, determines that such action will not result in degradation of service that affects aircraft safety, and includes such determination in the certification required under subsection (b). This air safety appraisal shall be issued jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Transportation before September 30, 1996, and shall be based on a coordinated review of all the airports in the United States subject to the certification requirements of subsection (b). The appraisal shall—

“(1) consider the weather information required to safely conduct aircraft operations and the extent to which such information is currently derived through manual observations provided by the National Weather Service and the Federal Aviation Administration, and automated observations provided from other sources including the Automated Weather Observation Service (AWOS), the Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS), and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES); and

“(2) determine whether the service provided by ASOS, and ASOS augmented where necessary by human observations, provides the necessary level of service consistent with the service standards encompassed in the criteria for automation of the field offices.”; and

(2) in section 707—

(A) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) DUTIES.—The Committee shall advise the Congress and the Secretary on—

“(1) the implementation of the Strategic Plan, annual development of the Plan, and establishment and implementation of modernization criteria; and

“(2) matters of public safety and the provision of weather services which relate to the comprehensive modernization of the National Weather Service.”; and

(B) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

“(f) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate—

“(1) on September 30, 1996; or

“(2) 90 days after the deadline for public comment on the modernization criteria for closure certification published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 704(b)(2), whichever occurs later.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ADDITIONAL MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Commerce should plan for the implementation of a follow-on modernization program aimed at improving weather services provided to areas which do not receive weather radar coverage at 10,000 feet. In carrying out such a program, the Secretary should plan for a procurement of Block II NEXRAD radar units.

#### SEC. 406. BASIC FUNCTIONS AND PRIVATIZATION OF NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(A) BASIC FUNCTIONS.—The basic functions of the National Weather Service shall be—

(1) the provision of forecasts and warnings including forecasts and warnings, of severe weather, flooding, hurricanes, and tsunami events;

(2) the collection, exchange, and distribution of meteorological, hydrologic, climatic, and oceanographic data and information; and

(3) the preparation of hydrometeorological guidance and core forecast information.

(b) PROHIBITION.—The National Weather Service shall not provide any new or enhanced weather services for the sole benefit of an identifiable private entity or group of such entities operating in any sector of the national or international economy in competition with the private weather service industry.

(c) NEW OR ENHANCED SERVICE.—If the Secretary determines, after consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, that a new or enhanced weather service is necessary and in the public interest to fulfill the international obligations of the United States, to enable State or Federal emergency or resource managers to better perform their State or Federal duties, or to carry out the functions of the National Weather Service described in subsection (a), the National Weather Service may provide such new or enhanced service as one of its basic functions if—

(1) each new or enhanced service provided by the National Weather Service will be limited to the level that the Secretary determines necessary to fulfill the requirements of this subsection, taking into account the capabilities and limitations of resources available, scientific knowledge, and technological capability of the National Weather Service; and

(2) upon request, the National Weather Service will promptly make available to any person the data or data products supporting the new or enhanced service provided pursuant to this section, at a cost not greater than that sufficient to recover the cost of dissemination.

(d) FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Secretary shall promptly publish in the Federal Register each determination made under subsection (c).

(e) PRIVATIZATION REVIEW.—The Secretary shall, by February 15, 1997, conduct a review of all existing weather services and activities performed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in order to identify those activities which may be transferred to the private sector. Such review shall include a determination that activities identified for privatization will continue to be disseminated to users on a reasonably affordable basis with no degradation of service. The Secretary shall, by March 15, 1997, pro-

vide to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a plan for transferring these identified services to the private sector.

#### SEC. 407. CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY RESEARCH.

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its climate and air quality research activities \$122,681,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) GLOBE.—Of the amount authorized in subsection (a), \$7,000,000 are authorized for fiscal year 1997 for a program to increase scientific understanding of the Earth and student achievement in math and science by using a worldwide network of schools to collect environmental observations. Beginning in fiscal year 1997, amounts appropriated for such program may be obligated only to the extent that an equal or greater amount of non-Federal funding is provided for such program.

#### SEC. 408. ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its atmospheric research activities \$43,766,000 for fiscal year 1997.

#### SEC. 409. SATELLITE OBSERVING AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out its satellite observing systems activities and data and information services, \$348,740,000 for fiscal year 1997, and, in addition, such sums as may be necessary to continue planning and development of a converged polar orbiting meteorological satellite program. None of the funds authorized in this subsection may be used for the purposes for which funds are authorized under section 105(d) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567).

(b) REPEAL.—Section 105(d)(2) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 is repealed.

#### SEC. 410. PROGRAM SUPPORT.

(A) EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out executive direction and administrative activities, including management, administrative support, provision of retired pay of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration commissioned officers, and policy development, \$64,694,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF FACILITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for acquisition, construction, maintenance, and operation of facilities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration \$37,366,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(c) AIRCRAFT SERVICES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out aircraft services activities, including aircraft operations, maintenance, and support, \$10,182,000 for fiscal year 1997.

#### SEC. 411. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

The Secretary of Commerce may conduct educational programs and activities related to the responsibilities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. For the purposes of this section, the Secretary may award grants and enter into cooperative agreements and contracts with States, private sector, and nonprofit entities.

**TITLE V—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the "Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1996".

**SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.**

For the purposes of this title, the term—

(1) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) "Agency" means the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(3) "Assistant Administrator" means the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development of the Agency.

**SEC. 503. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$580,460,000 for fiscal year 1997 for the Office of Research and Development for environmental research, development, and demonstration activities, including program management and support, in the areas specified in subsection (b).

(b) SPECIFIC PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated the following:

(1) For air related research, \$88,163,200.

(2) For water quality related research, \$26,293,800.

(3) For drinking water related research, \$26,593,700.

(4) For pesticide related research, \$20,632,000.

(5) For toxic chemical related research, \$12,341,500.

(6) For research related to hazardous waste, \$10,343,900.

(7) For multimedia related research expenses, \$300,837,000.

(8) For program management expenses, \$8,184,700.

(9) For research related to leaking underground storage tanks, \$681,000.

(10) For oil pollution related research, \$1,031,000.

(11) For environmental research laboratories, \$85,358,200.

(c) CONTINGENT AUTHORIZATION FOR RESEARCH RELATING TO THE CLEANUP OF CONTAMINATED SITES.—To the extent that the Hazardous Substances Trust Fund is authorized to receive funds during fiscal year 1997, there are authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year \$42,508,000 from such Fund to the Administrator for research relating to the cleanup of contaminated sites.

**TITLE VI—TECHNOLOGY****SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the "Technology Administration Authorization Act of 1996".

**SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) UNDER SECRETARY FOR TECHNOLOGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the activities of the Under Secretary for Technology/Office of Technology Policy \$9,531,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 1997 the following amounts:

(1) For Industrial Technology Services, \$450,000,000, of which—

(A) \$345,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Technology Program under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n); and

(B) \$105,000,000 shall be for the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l).

(2) For Scientific and Technical Research and Services, \$270,744,000, of which—

(A) \$267,764,000 shall be for Laboratory Research and Services; and

(B) \$2,980,000 shall be for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award program under section 17 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a).

(3) For Construction of Research Facilities, \$105,240,000.

**SEC. 603. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENTS.**

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 25(c)—

(A) by striking "for a period not to exceed six years" in paragraph (1); and

(B) by striking "which are designed" and all that follows through "operation of a Center" in paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "to a maximum of 1/3 Federal funding. Each Center which receives financial assistance under this section shall be evaluated during its sixth year of operations, and at least once each two years thereafter as the Secretary considers appropriate, by an evaluation panel appointed by the Secretary in the same manner as was the evaluation panel previously appointed. The Secretary shall not provide funding for additional years of the Center's operation unless the most recent evaluation is positive and the Secretary finds that continuation of funding furthers the purposes of this section"; and

(2) in section 28—

(A) by striking "or contracts" in subsection (b)(1)(B), and inserting in lieu thereof "contracts, and, subject to the last sentence of this subsection, other transactions";

(B) by inserting "and if the non-Federal participants in the joint venture agree to pay at least 50 percent of the total costs of the joint venture during the Federal participation period, which shall not exceed 5 years," after "participation to be appropriate,";

(C) by striking "provision of a minority share of the cost of such joint ventures for up to 5 years, and (ii)" in subsection (b)(1)(B), and inserting in lieu thereof "and";

(D) by striking "and cooperative agreements" in subsection (b)(2), and inserting in lieu thereof "cooperative agreements, and, subject to the last sentence of this subsection, other transactions";

(E) by adding after subsection (b)(4) the following:

"The authority under paragraph (1)(B) and paragraph (2) to enter into other transactions shall apply only if the Secretary, acting through the Director, determines that standard contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements are not feasible or appropriate, and only when other transaction instruments incorporate terms and conditions that reflect the use of generally accepted commercial accounting and auditing practices."; and

(F) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(k) Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii) and subsection (d)(3), the Director may grant extensions beyond the deadlines established under those subsections for joint venture and single applicant awardees to expend Federal funds to complete their projects, if such extension may be granted with no additional cost to the Federal Government and it is in the Federal Government's interest to do so."

**TITLE VII—UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION****SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the "Fire Administration Authorization Act of 1996".

**SEC. 702. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Section 17(g)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2216(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (E);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) \$27,560,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997."

**TITLE VIII—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT****SEC. 801. AVIATION RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION.**

Section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "Not more than the following amounts" and inserting in lieu thereof "For fiscal year 1997, not more than \$195,700,000 for Research, Engineering, and Development";

(2) by inserting "40119, 44912," after "carry out sections"; and

(3) by striking "of this title" and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "of this title".

**SEC. 802. RESEARCH PRIORITIES.**

Section 48102(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by striking "AVAILABILITY FOR RESEARCH.—(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "RESEARCH PRIORITIES.—(1) The Administrator shall consider the advice and recommendations of the research advisory committee established by section 44508 of this title in establishing priorities among major categories of research and development activities carried out by the Federal Aviation Administration.

"(2)".

**SEC. 803. RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

Section 44508(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "and"; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) annually review the allocation made by the Administrator of the amounts authorized by section 48102(a) of this title among the major categories of research and development activities carried out by the Administration and provide advice and recommendations to the Administrator on whether such allocation is appropriate to meet the needs and objectives identified under subparagraph (A)."

**SEC. 804. NATIONAL AVIATION RESEARCH PLAN.**

Section 44501(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A) by striking "15-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "5-year";

(2) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

"(B) The plan shall—

"(i) provide estimates by year of the schedule, cost, and work force levels for each active and planned major research and development project under sections 40119, 44504, 44505, 44507, 44509, 44511-44513, and 44912 of this title, including activities carried out under cooperative agreements with other Federal departments and agencies;

"(ii) specify the goals and the priorities for allocation of resources among the major categories of research and development activities, including the rationale for the priorities identified;

“(iii) identify the allocation of resources among long-term research, near-term research, and development activities; and

“(iv) highlight the research and development activities that address specific recommendations of the research advisory committee established under section 44508 of this title, and document the recommendations of the committee that are not accepted, specifying the reasons for nonacceptance.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting “, including a description of the dissemination to the private sector of research results and a description of any new technologies developed” after “during the prior fiscal year”.

#### **TITLE IX—NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM**

##### **SEC. 901. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Section 12 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7) by striking “and \$25,750,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$25,750,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and \$18,825,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “and \$50,676,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$50,676,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and \$46,130,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997”;

(3) in subsection (c) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation, \$28,400,000 for fiscal year 1997, including \$17,500,000 for engineering research and \$10,900,000 for geosciences research.”; and

(4) in subsection (d) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$1,932,000 for fiscal year 1997.”.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I am offering is in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3322 and its contents have been alluded to in earlier debate. We will refer to this substitute as a Democratic substitute but I believe that it also represents the views of most moderate Republicans in the House and in the other body. It also seeks to preserve many investments in research and development initiated under the past Republican administrations of George Bush and Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Chairman, the key feature of this substitute is that it provides sustaining funding this year for valuable science and technology programs within an overall balanced budget plan, the plan submitted by the administration on March 19. The Congressional Budget Office has certified that this plan does balance the budget by the year 2002.

The substitute I am offering, like H.R. 3322, is a 1-year bill. This is a critical year, however, in the long-range context. There are now no real differences between the Democrats and Republicans over the commitment to cut spending and balance the budget. The question is one of priorities and of process, as I tried to describe a few

minutes ago. How do we achieve this balanced budget and at the same time maintain critical levels of investment in the very things that have been the source of and necessary to continue to stimulate our economy?

In reducing the size of Government, it is imperative that we recognize that this is not simply an accounting exercise. We must take a good hard look at the programs we want to preserve and provide the necessary funding to transition them to more efficient technologies while restructuring them in a sensible way. The Democratic substitute does this.

We recognize that some agencies, such as NASA, have made heroic strides in downsizing and we have made an effort to meet their request levels to continue on this track. We have not rewarded them with additional cuts in personnel and programs as has H.R. 3322, an action that will only make it all the more difficult for them to achieve what we all want.

This substitute also establishes priorities within R&D that best address some of our most pressing challenges in the future. This bill provides funding for technology partnerships in the Manufacturing Extension Program and the Advanced Technology Program. These efforts will increase the productivity of American industry to allow them to compete in the future world economy. In a more direct sense, these programs will provide jobs both today and in the future. However, these programs have fallen within the purview of what the chairman of our committee calls corporate welfare and they are scheduled to be eliminated by this legislation.

The substitute also provides funding for energy conservation programs, solar and renewables, fossil energy programs, and fusion energy research. Some of these are in what I have described, either the liberal claptrap or corporate welfare category. At a time when our national attention is fixed on rising energy prices and our dependence on fluctuating world markets, it is imperative that we continue the drive for energy independence.

In the environmental area, the substitute provides funding to develop a full understanding of key environmental issues such as ozone depletion and climate change in order to provide a basis for any future policy, regulation, or international agreement. Democrats strongly believe that the fundamental approach to risk-based regulations is sound R&D. We have not banned any research in this substitute as does H.R. 3322, nor have we taken the position that these problems will go away if we simply kill the research.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the substitute bill provides a balanced set of R&D priorities that include both basic and applied research. We believe that the concept of basic versus applied research are inseparable and both are valuable contributors to our long-term economic growth and intellectual lead-

ership. We believe that a rigid ideological approach to restricting the Federal role only to basic research is profoundly misguided, and that position is one supported by the Council on Competitiveness.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. We found in our markup before the Committee on Science that the authors of H.R. 3322 have a fundamental misconception of what basic research is. The categories of research they have defined as basic do not comport with any other definitions used by the OMB, by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, or by any other group that we know of. Yet the definitions that have been fabricated for the purpose of this bill constitute the underlying science policy and budget policy that the authors intend to guide the science establishment.

We found, when examining the actual figures in H.R. 3322 and the substitute I am offering, that the Republican bill is virtually identical in fiscal year 1996 levels for overall basic research. My substitute represents an increase of about 3 percent over fiscal year 1996 levels. Thus, contrary to the assertions of its authors, H.R. 3322 offers no increase in basic research over the President or over my substitute. In fact, just the opposite is true.

The most significant budgetary problem however, is represented by the nonbasic research programs that include such important activities as weather forecasting, aeronautical research, environmental research as well as personnel levels of scientists and engineers. The Republican bill cuts these accounts by over 7 percent in nominal terms, close to 10 percent with inflation. My substitute provides enough to keep pace with inflation this year.

I will close by acknowledging today that an even greater personal concern of mine is how these science programs will fare over the next decade. Although there has been an intense debate between the Republicans and the White House over how much to reduce discretionary spending as a part of any overall budget agreement, I personally believe that civilian R&D has suffered too much, especially in NASA. I hope that both sides can take a more enlightened look at the importance of our R&D investments over the long term and reassess our budget needs in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I am enclosing with this statement a summary of the specific actions my substitute takes to address some of the shortcomings of H.R. 3322 and provide a more reasoned approach to R&D priorities this fiscal year. The Democratic substitute is better for the environment, better for job creation and competitiveness, better for education, and better for science. I ask all my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

## COMPARISON OF H.R. 3322, THE OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996, and the Brown Substitute

## BACKGROUND

H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996, was reported by the Science Committee on April 24, 1996. The bill authorizes research and other programs in FY 1997 for the National Science Foundation (NSF), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), U.S. Fire Administration, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program. H.R. 3322 does not include the Department of Energy (DOE), whose FY 97 research programs were authorized by the House on October 12, 1995 (H.R. 2405). It also does not include authorization for the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) or the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (NEP)—two NIST programs that are considered high-priority by the Clinton Administration.

A Democratic Alternative to H.R. 3322 which tracks the President's FY 97 budget request was offered by Rep. George Brown at Committee markup and was voted down 27-21 on a straight party-line basis. Although the bill and the Alternative are both described as consistent with a balanced budget, they differ sharply on policy and funding.

## POLICY &amp; FUNDING PROVIDED BY BROWN AMENDMENT

For NSF: Adds \$74M (4.4%) to overall budget, a 3% increase over FY 96 versus less than 1% in H.R. 3322; restores \$9M in Salaries & Expenses account to avoid delays in processing proposals; allows NSF to maintain the Directorate for Social, Economic, and Behavioral Sciences; and eliminates \$100M in Facilities Modernization account to fund research instead of bricks in accord with Director's request.

For NASA: Adds \$308M (2%) to overall budget; restores funding to personnel account to avoid additional furloughs at NASA centers; restores \$374M (27%) cut from Mission to Planet Earth and \$34M (18%) cut from Advanced Subsonics Research; fully funds President's request for Space Sciences account; and gives a clear mandate to study the climate and environment of Earth.

For NOAA: Retains but streamlines the "certification" process for closure of weather stations; Outlines policy for promoting public and private roles in weather forecasting; and Restores the bill's cuts in weather forecasting activities and environmental research.

For EPA: Restores \$92M (16%) for environmental R&D; authorizes Superfund R&D; and eliminates bans on climate, indoor air and environmental technologies research.

For NIST: Restores funding for the Technology Administration (\$10M), Advanced Technology Program (\$345M), and Manufacturing Extension Partnership (\$105M)—all eliminated by H.R. 3322 and funds Labs at the President's request.

For FAA: Consolidates scattered research accounts into a single R&D account.

For DOE: Restores deep cuts in Solar & Conservation (50%), Renewables (30%), Biological and Environmental (10%), Fusion (20%), and Fossil Research (30%) accounts, as required by the House-passed H.R. 2405.

## SUMMARY

The Brown substitute supports "basic research", as defined by the research agencies themselves, more generously than the Republican bill (\$6.02 vs. \$5.85 billion). Brown supports applied research and development much more generously than H.R. 3322.

The Brown substitute supports technology partnerships, which are critical to creating high-wage jobs, as recommended by the recent Council on Competitiveness report "Endless Frontier, Limited Resources: U.S. R&D Policy for Competitiveness."

The Brown substitute supports important environmental research initiatives, rather than screening these programs through an ideological filter.

## BUDGET SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	Fiscal year 1995	Fiscal year 1996	H.R. 3322/2405	Brown alternative
NSF	3,264	3,220	3,250	3,235
NASA	14,464	13,885	13,496	13,804
USFA	34	28	28	28
NOAA <sup>1</sup>	1,349	1,324	1,308	1,463
EPA	588	525	487	579
Technology Administration	8	7	0	10
NIST	701	620	386	826
FAA	0	186	186	196
NEHRP	0	95	95	95
DOE	5,281	4,578	4,001	4,797
Total	25,689	24,468	23,237	25,123

<sup>1</sup> NOAA funding figures reflect the status of the bill upon adoption of a Manager's amendment which removes programs within the jurisdiction of the Resources Committee. The bill as reported cuts an additional \$170 million from these programs.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brown substitute.

I do so for many reasons. The underlying bill is based upon a false premise and is basically an abdication of Federal participation in research and development.

When I came to Congress I wanted to serve on the Science Committee because I recognize that, in addition to regulatory reform and balancing the budget, we need a sound research and development policy to achieve economic security.

I can not begin to describe my disappointment over the way the Science Committee dealt with its authorization. Basically, we have abandoned any debate over policy in favor of partisanship. You will hear much rhetoric about how much the Science Committee contributed towards balancing the budget.

The truth is that our committee was presented with alternative budgets for most of our accounts, all of which fell within the constraints of a balanced budget plan—the one put forward by the Senate Budget Committee, and here in the House by the coalition.

Were these considered on their merits? No. Instead, Members were told that there was only one vision, the vision the chairman put forward about how much each Appropriations subcommittee 602(b) allocations would be dedicated to our accounts. This was not reality, and a further examination shows the fiscal year 1996 budget eventually turned out to be very much like the levels of the alternative proposals that had been based on balanced budgets put forward by both parties.

Since last year's omnibus science bill did not accomplish much, we tried a different approach this year. What kind of improvements did we make?

Well, the two most noticeable changes are that we skipped subcommittee markup, and also that we decided to consider a number of our

programs outside Science Committee jurisdiction, while ignoring some major responsibilities.

The Brown substitute is a much more realistic approach to meeting our Nation's research and development needs while still maintaining our commitment to a balanced budget. It is a vast improvement over the underlying bill in numerous ways, but the one I want to focus on is it includes something the manager's amendment does not—a title covering the Department of Energy's research and development programs.

Last October, when the House considered H.R. 2405, an amendment offered by Chairman WALKER was adopted which raised authorization levels for fiscal year 1996 to meet the previously appropriated level, but also set fiscal year 1997 levels.

This amendment was clear evidence of how irrelevant the Science Committee has been in the area of energy research. The fiscal year 1996 levels in the Walker amendment merely reflected what the appropriations had already done with these programs, and the fiscal year 1997 levels were not the result of Science Committee action.

In the debate action over the inclusion of fiscal year 1997 authorization in the Walker amendment, Science Committee Chairman WALKER stated, "I never contended that I brought this matter before the committee. I brought it to the floor as my own amendment."

Since the House acted on H.R. 2405, there have been several developments which warrant reconsideration of these numbers.

For instance, the Congressional Budget Office has revised its economic assumptions, resulting in greater flexibility in making discretionary spending decisions. Also, the Energy and Environment Subcommittee has held a series of hearings on energy research and development, which have proven to be very helpful in our ability to judge the value of the various programs in question.

While I am grateful to Energy and Environment Subcommittee Chairman ROHRBACHER for scheduling these hearings, they will be for nothing if the committee is unable to act on this hearing record in a timely manner.

The need to revisit DOE R&D funding is apparently shared by Chairman WALKER and Subcommittee Chairman ROHRBACHER, who, when we marked up the bill we have here today, publicly pledged their willingness to move a fiscal year 1997 DOE R&D authorization bill.

While I supported this approach, it is now becoming apparent that the markup of a separate DOE authorization will occur too late to influence this year's process.

□ 1730

Mr. Chairman, a previous colleague of mine asked the question where is the beef. In western Pennsylvania, we would say this bill is all foam and no beer.



Member's who are concerned about our energy security, and what we are doing to further it, should support the Brown substitute. Leaving it up to appropriators or the other body is not a responsible way to represent your constituents.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute which has been offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill, which has been offered by the Committee on Science, the so-called Walker bill, I believe is a direct attack on America's investment in the future. The business, academic, and scientific communities all ought to be outraged by the legislation in the form that it has been offered. It does not take much of a look at this bill, Mr. Chairman, to see that it is the Brown substitute that is in the best interest of continued economic growth.

We hear so much talk on the other side of the aisle how cutting taxes for the wealthy will lead to job growth, meanwhile this bill pulls the rug out from under the efforts to create whole new industries. One minute our Republican colleagues insist that we do away with regulations that supposedly stand in the way of job growth and the next minute they are cutting opportunities for new high paying jobs.

Civilian R&D, in my view, has been over the years, and will continue to be, about a lot more than just jobs, just the jobs that are involved in the research itself. The new technologies that offer potential from that R&D include:

More effective law enforcement; the reduction of environmental pollution; efficient environmental cleanups; increased national security; and more disposable income that we, as Americans, need from the savings that can be made through energy conservation.

That is naming a very few of those available.

Civilian R&D is probably the best way of ensuring that America remains competitive in the global economy, yet the underlying bill here, the Walker bill, reduces our chance to remain preeminent in science and technology, a preeminence which testifier after testifier said we were in danger of losing if we did not keep up our input and our commitment to our research base.

What we will end up with here is the need to import those new technologies from elsewhere if we lose the preeminence that we have had over a long period of time and our trade imbalance will now become a trade imbalance on the very thing that we have been the leaders on over decades, ever since the Second World War, really, in those areas of the development of new technologies and the wonderful research and development programs that we have maintained in this country over a period of at least 50 years.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is irresponsible and shortsighted for the Congress

to cut funding for energy conservation and to cut funding for renewable energy research. It is a wipeout of the funding for energy conservation research and a wipeout of the research into renewable energy sources. This bill erases any semblance of a national energy policy. Gone. Simply gone. Non-existent with this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is the way we should be preparing for the 21st century, as critical as the use of energy is in this whole society of ours.

Now, we are hearing a lot of rhetoric on the other side about defending basic research. In the underlying bill the Republican proposals are seriously less supportive of basic research than the substitute from the gentleman, the ranking member, the gentleman from California. The Republican explanations, which claim a more generous level for basic research funding, are based on an arbitrary classification of basic versus applied definitions, which we can all argue about, but it is an arbitrary definition which is not the definition of the standard classification as has been used by the OMB and which is also the classification used in all of the historical data for baseline comparisons on Federal investments in research.

For the NSF, which has been our premier basic research agency, support agency for everything but the biomedical sciences, the substitute bill by the gentleman from California provides growth of at least \$70 million more than the underlying bill. For research project support, the difference in growth is \$82 million greater on the part of the Brown substitute than from the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, these differences stand out in light of the many times we have heard Republican claims about the high priority that they place on basic research in the Federal R&D budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. VOLKMER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OLVER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the cold war is over, a fact which has changed our economy, so that civilian research is key to meeting our challenges under the new economy. We should be working to develop new technologies that will provide new opportunities to high-tech workers in civilian industries. And though the cold war may be over, the technological war has just begun.

America should be on the verge of a new technological frontier and making certain that we maintain our preeminence in both science and technology in this world. Yes, we have a budget deficit. Yes, we should eliminate waste. Yes, we should be extremely careful in how we expend every dollar that is spent, but the Brown substitute is in line with a balanced budget without retreating from scientific

and technological excellence in this country. The underlying bill, I believe, is irresponsible as a scientist, and America deserves better.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the substitute from the gentleman from California.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brown substitute, and I want to take a moment to say something about it. It is the right thing to do.

What I mean by that is that the Federal Government is fulfilling its proper role when it encourages technological research and development. It is fulfilling its proper role when it encourages us to look beyond our atmosphere for the answers to the questions we face.

Most of us can agree that the very nature of the Federal Government is changing. The functions that the Government has had throughout our lifetimes are changing—this is as it should be. The Federal Government needs to be much smaller and more responsive to the American people. And we are beginning to move in that direction.

For example, NASA should concentrate on reducing costs and encouraging greater involvement by the private sector. In conversations I have had with Administrator Goldin, I know that he is eager to continue the agency's trends in this direction.

But I believe fundamentally that the United States should maintain its position as the leader in science and space research.

Two weeks ago in this room we met to debate the 1997 budget resolution. The Blue Dogs submitted their budget plan which would have set us on a path to achieve a balanced budget by 2002. It would have forced all of us to tighten our belts a notch or two and get our fiscal house in order. In fact, our plan borrowed \$137 billion less than the majority version. Unfortunately our budget plan was defeated.

But Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget, which garnered significant bipartisan support, specifically endorsed the funding levels for science and technology contained in this substitute. We did this because we believed that America must continue to be a leader. H.R. 3322 is a step away from the cutting edge. That is not a direction I want to go.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that I do not endorse increased spending lightly. We have to think about the return on our investments. Keeping these programs properly funded is an investment we can count on. I urge my colleagues to support the Brown substitute.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the bill in favor of the gentleman's substitute amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brown substitute to H.R. 3322. This so-called omnibus bill has several missing pieces.

This omnibus bill does not contain an authorization for the Department of Commerce's technology programs housed at the National Institute of Science and Technology. These programs are designed to help industry develop new technologies. They provide medium-sized companies with scarce matching funds and necessary manufacturing information.

H.R. 3322 cuts personnel accounts at the National Weather Service. Coming from Florida where hurricanes are a major weather threat, I feel that these cuts are unjustifiable. This action leaves many areas of the country at risk from severe weather events.

But this measure does not stop there. It also takes shots at another major presence in Florida, NASA. The funding levels proposed in the bill translate into personnel layoffs at the NASA facilities in Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on, but these few examples are proof enough that his bill needs fixing. I urge opposition to this bill and support the Brown substitute.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3322 seeks to create the impression that we are considering an omnibus civilian science proposal, but we are not. Noticeably absent are the energy research and development [R&D] programs at the Department of Energy [DOE]. How do we explain the absence of about \$4.7 billion in authorizations for the civilian science programs at DOE?

Federal support for R&D is the quintessential investment in our Nation's future. Unfortunately, despite 50 years of strong bipartisan support, the Republican leadership now treats R&D as a low priority. The overall reduction would be \$711 million below this year's funding and nearly \$800 million below the President's proposal. Solar and renewable energy research would be cut 34 percent. Conservation energy R&D would be slashed 43 percent. Fuel Cell research would be cut 66 percent. And I would remind my colleagues that this is all being done in 1 year, not over 5 years or 7 years.

We cannot let stand congressional proposals that endanger our ability to create more high-income jobs in developing industries as well as to promote safer, more cost-efficient and environmentally sensitive energy technologies.

R&D is responsible for approximately one-half of the productivity improvements in the Nation's economy. Technological innovation is the single most important source of long-term economic growth, and the total economic return on investment in R&D is several times as high as for other forms of investment.

While Republicans seek to make political hay out of the gas price spike we are currently suffering, they are cutting the research at DOE that moves us

away from dependence upon gasoline. While Senator DOLE proposes a cut in the gas tax, House Republicans propose to cut DOE's transportation energy research budget by \$66.8 million below this year's funding, a 38 percent cut.

We don't know when or if the Republicans will make good on these threats to cut DOE. For the sake of my home State of California, I hope they do not. The Department of Energy calculated that California received about \$722 million in energy R&D funding in fiscal year 1995. We are heavily involved in programs like energy conservation research, and research on fusion energy development, both of which are hit heavily in the Republican proposals. I mentioned fuel cell research as an area being targeted and as one that is important to a state seeking to sustain our economic recovery while maintaining our air quality. In the Third District, we have the University of California at Davis, which ranks in the top 20 universities in Federal research grants and is responsible for managing three DOE laboratories. All of these programs are at risk if the Republican committee proposal prevails.

The substitute offered by Mr. BROWN today contains all of the programs that should be in an omnibus bill, including the DOE programs. And it funds them at the President's request level. If you are concerned, as I am, about our energy future you will support Mr. BROWN. If you want energy security in the future, as I know the residents of my State do, you will support the Brown substitute.

□ 1745

So I certainly wish today to go on record in support of my colleague's substitute amendment, and in strong opposition to the bill as it has been reported out of the Committee on Science.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Brown substitute to the Omnibus science bill. The substitute provides, in my opinion, more adequate funding levels and makes a better investment in environment, science, and technology.

Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] who rose, I was a strong supporter of the so-called blue dog budget each time it has been offered. That budget reached balance within 6 years. It reached balance by cutting more spending, frankly, than any of the alternatives that were offered on this floor, and it reduced the deficit more quickly than any other alternative on this floor.

But as the gentleman from Texas, who is in my opinion the premier balanced-budget individual on this floor in either party, said so correctly, that budget provided for adequate funds to fund the space and science programs addressed by this bill more adequately than are provided in this bill.

I am particularly pleased that the Brown amendment authorizes funding

for Mission to Planet Earth at the President's requested level of \$1.4 billion. The restoration of the President's request would eliminate the 27-percent cut to the Earth observing system which is the centerpiece of NASA's contribution to the global effort to understand how the Earth's climate works and to use that technology to improve our lives.

I personally consider Mission to Planet Earth to be one of NASA's and America's most promising and important undertakings. I am pleased of course that Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, MD, has the lead responsibility for implementing the critical research program which helps us as a Nation and as a people to understand the Earth's global environment.

A perspective from space, Mr. Chairman, is critical. Only from above is it realistically possible to observe distant parts of the world's oceans, deserts, and polar regions, using a macro approach. But most importantly, it allows people to be more informed about what is happening in their own State or their own region.

Mission to Planet Earth will further the understanding of the causes of natural disasters, and how to respond to them. The Earth observing system, the core component of Mission to Planet Earth, will dramatically improve agricultural and natural resources productivity. In fact, it is likely to allow climate predictions a year or more in advance.

Not only will this serve as a scientific benefit, but it will result in substantial benefits and saving to policymakers, the taxpayers, farmers, and businesspeople alike. I might say, Mr. Chairman, as an aside, to golfers as well.

Mission to Planet Earth is still an evolving program. Reducing the funding level does not take into account the substantial reductions the program has already undergone. It also sends the wrong message to our international partners who have invested in this globally integrated program.

Over the last 5 years, NASA has reduced funding for the program through the year 2000 by 60 percent while still maintaining the 24 critical science measurements endorsed by the greater science community and preserving critical launch schedules.

In addition, NASA has committed to further reducing costs and duplicate tasks through incorporation of technology and stronger links with commercial interagency and international partners.

If Congress wants to keep the program viable, we must realize that enough is enough. We have cut, but if we cut more, we will cut very deeply and seriously into the effectiveness of a critical program. I believe we must continue this investment in understanding the planet.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I will say that the salary and expense levels provided in the Brown substitute will preclude substantial numbers of layoffs

and/or RIF's, which will further undermine the effectiveness of this program. I regret very seriously that the bill itself has proposed such serious cuts in salary and expense levels.

If the programs are to continue, we need to provide for the appropriate level of funding for those who will continue that program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Brown substitute, which provides funding for Mission to Planet Earth at the President's requested level. I plan to work with the Committee on Appropriations to ensure that objective as well.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Brown substitute. Unlike the underlying bill, the amendment authorizes the energy program of the Department of Energy at appropriate levels for 1997.

Last year's authorization bill contained a 2-year authorization for the Department of Energy, and the bill before us today makes no mention of these programs. That leaves us with the authorization levels from last year's bill, and that is not good policy. Mr. Chairman, by allowing these authorization levels to stand, we are giving away our responsibility to provide program directions.

The amendment makes the tough choices we need to fund energy programs. Fossil energy programs are scaled back while the overall level for energy R&D is funded at a higher level than the House budget resolution.

The amendment provides full funding for fusion energy research and development on a bipartisan basis. Over 65 Members of the House signed letters to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], requesting full funding of these programs.

The amendment also enhances basic research at the Department of Energy. This amendment provides almost \$60 million more for high energy and nuclear physics research than the current authorization levels.

The amendment also provides full funding for such crucial programs as the Environmental Technologies Initiative, the U.S. Global Change Research Program, and high-performance computing programs at the Department of Energy.

These sensible authorization levels do not bust the budget. The figures of the Brown substitute are consistent with a balanced budget by year 2002 as presented by both the President and the Coalition, the blue dog's budget.

I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for a reasonable energy policy.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute offered by Mr. BROWN tries, I think, to achieve a balance between short-term, medium-term and long-term research

goals in the Federal Government, and has done so in a sound, fiscally responsible manner.

The bill represents a best effort to develop a research and development policy that reflects today's economic realities and the need to balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, our Government needs to be an ally of business, not an adversary, and the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] tries to make that truly come to pass. The amendment follows the advice of the recently released Council on Competitiveness report entitled "Endless Frontier, Limited Resources." The report's central finding is that research and development partnerships hold the key to meeting the challenge of transition that our Nation now faces.

Included in this definition of partnerships are the Partnership for a New Generation Vehicle, the Advanced Technology Program, and Cooperative Research and Development Agreements. H.R. 3322 moves in a direction that is counter to the council's recommendations, and in my opinion, has potentially devastating consequences for our country's future.

Mr. Chairman, the bill itself maintains the outdated distinction, again quoting the Council on Competitiveness report, between basic and applied research; and based on this distinction, eliminates funding for applied research and government-industry-university partnerships, which almost everyone who has studied this equation from a nonbiased point of view thinks is a shortsighted way to go in the future, and is not going to be at all helpful for the scientific community in this country.

The Brown substitute authorizes at a level consistent with balancing the budget as has been stated in the blue dog coalition budget and, in my judgment, goes in the direction we need to go.

Over and over again today we see business, because of the vagaries in the marketplace, unable to invest in "blue sky" research; that research that does not have in its immediate vision a way to bring a product to market and manufacture and market it commercially, in other words, get a return on investment.

These partnerships then become all the more important for our country to maintain its technological and scientific base. With these partnerships, not giveaways and grants, but partnerships where industry working with government can both reap a reward from breakthrough, new technologies.

This is serious business. The Brown substitute, in my judgment, is much more responsible to maintain and enhance on the scientific and technology base that exists in business, industry, and universities, and Federal laboratories across the country, and I would urge its adoption.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why the substitute offered by the gentleman from California ought to be approved by this House, but let me just name two.

First, at a time when this Nation should be marching boldly into the information age, the Science Committee has reported a timid bill that is wholly inadequate to the technological challenges that confront us.

This bill reported by the Science Committee cuts \$1.2 billion from the President's science and technology request. Basic research alone is \$170 million below the President's request.

This bill is plainly not the best we can do. It will make it harder for us to harness the enormous promise of the information age, to conduct the basic research that will make America more productive, and to improve the scientific proficiency of American schoolchildren.

Second, this bill is a slap in the face to the dedicated Federal workers who administer our research portfolio. This includes employees of NASA, NOAA, and the National Science Foundation. For the NSF alone, it actually cuts \$7 million from the agency's salaries and expenses.

This cut is made despite the fact that the NSF has one of the best records in Government of holding its costs down. Only 4 percent of the NSF's budget goes to internal operations. During the past decade, the NSF work force has remained constant in the face of a doubling of its workload.

How does the Science Committee propose to reward this outstanding record? With a cut in salaries and expenses that will cause the loss of as many as 120 positions from the agency, that's how. The Brown substitute restores these cuts and assures that the NSF and other agencies will have the resources they need to administer the agency's enormous research program effectively.

Mr. Speaker, when the leadership of this House closed the Government down at Christmas, there was a picture that appeared in many newspapers. It showed the mailroom of the National Science Foundation piling up with research proposals.

When we finally ended that shutdown and reopened American Government, the scientists and engineers at the NSF went quietly back to work, cleared out the backlog, and got our civilian science program back on its feet. It's just plain wrong to now cut what has plainly been an exceedingly well-run agency.

I urge my colleagues to support the Brown substitute.

□ 1800

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon in opposition to H.R. 3322 and in strong support of the Brown substitute. We have been lulled into complacency by the last few years of ample energy supplies. It should not take a dramatic

rise in the price of gasoline for Congress to remember our responsibilities to the energy supply and to the security of this Nation.

Unless we pass the Brown substitute, this Congress will only perpetuate the type of complacency that we cannot accept. We need only look to the Middle East to see how our energy security and national security are intimately related. We fought the Persian Gulf war in large part over a threat to our oil supply. The Department of Energy is forecasting that we will become even more dependent on this volatile source of energy during the next 20 years.

Our only insurance policy against future energy security problems, like more gas hikes, further pollution and degradation of the environment, is energy research and development. Yet the bill before us today continues extreme cuts to energy research and development that were passed last year by this Chamber in a truncated process and are again a part of this year's budget resolution. In fact, this year's cuts in renewable and solar research and development are an additional 30 percent from last year, which was cut 30 percent from 1995. Thus, this bill represents a 50-percent cut from the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, the majority must believe that the American people will not notice that Congress is cutting energy efficiency and renewable research and development. Perhaps they think the American people will not care. However, poll after poll shows that the American people not only know about these programs but overwhelmingly support them. Every single day, the American people appreciate the lower electricity and heating bills that Federal energy research and development has brought to them because of energy efficient refrigerators and new window technologies. With each new breakthrough in renewable fuels, this country moves closer to the day when we can significantly reduce our dependence on imported oil and become more self-sufficient in all forms of energy. It will also increase our chronic trade deficit problem. Roughly 50 percent of our trade deficit is caused by the imports of foreign oil. That also augers well for our national security, enabling us to become less vulnerable to interruptions in supply from foreign oil sources.

Expanding the development of renewable energy is beneficial to our national economy. Exports of these new energy technologies on the world market are a significant opportunity. American entrepreneurs and national labs in our country represent the cutting edge of this industry. We must not pull the plug on the small businesses that are in this field and lose out on this untapped potential.

Mr. Chairman, renewable energy technologies provide a boost in economic benefits to our rural communities. Farmer-owned ethanol plants have brought new jobs to many declining rural communities that depend on

corn production, not to mention the benefit of displacing imported oil. Wind energy is another cutting edge technology that holds promise throughout the windy Great Plains States, yet the committee's budget zeroes out wind energy research and development funding just when the industry is on the verge of production cost competitiveness.

We must not overlook the environmental benefits that renewable energy technologies provide. As clean technologies like wind, biomass, solar, geothermal, and hydro continue to displace coal and oil, the air we breathe will improve.

I would also like to point out, as have several other speakers, that the Brown substitute is compatible with the Blue Dog balanced budget. Do not believe the complaints from the other side that say that support for the Brown substitute will bust the budget. It is not true. The American public understands that we have too much at stake in energy security, in curbing pollution, and creating and capturing high technology markets. Let us show the American people that Congress has gotten the message.

I urge my colleagues to support the Brown substitute that would fully fund energy research and development activities and oppose H.R. 3322.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a little over a year ago, I arrived in the U.S. Congress and had the pleasure of being able to be assigned to the House Committee on Science, a committee that I thought had as its message and mission the creation of work for the 21st century. It is in this committee's responsibility or amongst its responsibilities to be the guiding force and partner with the private sector as it relates to research and development, space and environmental research, as well. But at the same time, I have argued vigorously for an inner-city district, like the 18th Congressional District, that our support of science creates opportunities for our young people as we move toward the 21st century.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is with great sadness that I rise, as I have indicated, in opposition to the present H.R. 3322 and vigorously support the Brown substitute, hoping that we will have an opportunity to support this amendment in a balanced and bipartisan manner, for this is in fact a representative of a balanced approach to science as we move toward the 21st century. It recognizes the responsibility that we have for fiscal integrity. But, at the same time, it acknowledges what role we have on the world arena in terms of supporting science.

The Brown amendment, in fact, restores cuts in salaries and expense accounts, preventing delays in the processing of scientific grant proposals throughout the country for the National Science Foundation, one of the premier institutions that helps to

carry the message of science across this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, it allows the National Science Foundation to maintain a directorate for the social, economic, and behavioral sciences. It restores the \$2 billion that is so needed to make our science mission a real mission.

As it relates to NASA, the Brown substitute protects the President's request for Mission to Planet Earth but, more important, allows us to study the environmental impact on all that is occurring around us. It gives us long-range planning opportunities, and it provides a clear mandate from NASA to study the climate and environment of the Earth, something that I would imagine none of us would disagree with.

In particular something that I am very concerned about, having visited several of our NASA centers around the Nation and, in fact, watched NASA over the last year and a half almost reduce itself to a lean, mean operating machine, and yet we are cutting some \$18.5 million in salaries, which will drastically cut into the NASA centers and jeopardize NASA's ability to safely deliver its programs. That is a reduction in force totaling 1,400 employees by October 1, 1996, a physical legal impossibility, or an agencywide furlough of 21,000 employees for 12 to 14 days. Someone would simply ask the question: How much more can we take? Are we really serious about our commitment to science and research in this Nation?

Then might I add, in my dismay as I looked at this legislation for the Department of Energy and the research and technology research that it provides, it is not listed. And I would like to bring to the attention of the chairman a letter that I received from my department of commerce in the State of Texas, acknowledging the importance of the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the MEP Program in particular. The kind of small- and medium-sized companies that benefit from MEP employ nearly 12 million people, roughly 65 percent of the manufacturing work force. This amendment and substitute restores that funding.

Last year over 25,000 of these small businesses benefited from the MEP support, and more than 1,300 letters of support were sent to Congress from small businesses. Are we for the small business community? I do not know about that.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation that is on the floor does not seem to suggest that we are prepared to provide small businesses the opportunity for science and research. The Brown amendment does. Then we want to close out on the Advanced Technology Program. I am shocked when we begin to look at this country's role on the international arena. This should be a bipartisan, unified effort to support a program that provides a partnership.

We are not asking for Government dominance, but we are asking for the Government to recognize they have a real role in research and development with the private sector. We are abdicating that responsibility. I support the Brown substitute because it clearly acknowledges that.

Mr. Chairman, European nations are accelerating investment in commercial technology. Japan has plans in the works to double the government's science program. China plans to triple its investment in R&D. Korea has considerably boosted its R&D efforts. Mr. Chairman, it is important that we respond to the international arena of science in a bipartisan way. Support NASA with the personnel funding. Support these science programs as well as these research and development efforts. Let us support the Brown substitute.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us for our consideration, the Brown substitute to H.R. 3322. This substitute has what H.R. 3322 does not have—a balanced and thoughtful approach to this Nation's research and development, science, and space enterprises. The Democrats on the committee felt that too many changes were necessary to make the chairman's bill a satisfactory piece of legislation and that the only way to address many of the problems was to offer a complete substitute. Although this committee has oversight responsibilities, it has been my experience that only disaster can result when people without expertise or experience begin to micromanage what they do not know, as in the case of H.R. 3322. This legislation continues to attempt to force the Republican ideological and personal viewpoints upon not only the rest of the Nation, but the futures of our children as well. They criticize EPA and environmental regulations, but won't allow the agency to conduct the research to answer important questions.

Among the many problems contained within the chairman's bill which the Brown substitute fixes are:

The Republican's personal and lonely vendetta against NASA's Mission To Planet Earth Program, reducing the administration's request by more than \$300 million, eliminating spacecraft and restructuring the program even though he has never actually had to operate or run a multibillion dollar space program. The President has made this program a NASA priority, the Senate has strongly supported this program, and the chairman's own National Research Council evaluation validated it.

The substitute includes the \$81.5 million requested by the administration for NASA salaries and personnel, but cut by the chairman. If this substitute fails I will offer a separate amendment to add back this \$81.5 million. While this may not seem like much to the Republicans, they still have their jobs and are not threatened with a layoff or reduction in force [RIF]. A cut of this magnitude will mean that the hardworking employees of the Johnson Space Center in Houston will have to forgo pay that they have earned and deserve.

The substitute supports the basic research components of the administration's multi-agency research initiatives in important areas to the Nation's economic future: high performance computing, and communications, environment and natural resources, and advanced manufacturing techniques.

The substitute includes a Department of Energy title, which the chairman's bill does not and it reverses the deep Republican cuts in fossil R&D, solar and renewables R&D conservation R&D and fusion energy R&D, the MEP and ATP.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brown substitute as an attempt to reach a moderate approach consistent with a balanced budget to our national science and technology policy. As we review the activity, to the extent there has been any in this Gingrich Congress with reference to science and technology, I think it has to be conceded that the major accomplishment of the House Committee on Science over this Congress occurred on the first day of Congress. That was the day that the name of the committee was changed. Since the time of the name change, other than that, the activity of the committee has been pretty downhill.

After embracing some of the Gingrich agenda to hamstring Federal health and safety regulation and pursuing a technology policy that basically said, if our research has any immediate application, then we do not want to fund it, we only want to fund the most theoretical research, the committee basically has done very little. For over 4 months, it did not meet at all. Last year it has as its monument, as a committee of this Congress, it has one committee report. It did not manage to get a single thing written into law during all of 1995. And today the do-little approach of this do-little committee is projected through the legislation that is offered tonight as an alternative to the Brown substitute. It says we ought to do the same thing with reference to the future of this country in science and technology. You see, instead of the kind of dispassionate, bipartisan, moderate approach of moving forward that occurred not just in prior Democratic administrations but in prior Republican administrations of people working together realizing that, if there is any subject that ought to be bipartisan, it is science and technology policy.

We have substituted the scoring apparently of political points for that kind of moderate approach and substituted arrogance for reasoned discourse. Let me give just a few examples of how the Brown substitute, an alternative, proposes to deal with these problems. First in the area of the National Science Foundation, as my colleague from Virginia pointed out, this is a fairly small agency. All this talk about bureaucracy, it has a very efficient program. About 4 percent of its budget of the tax dollars are spent on administration. To be sure, we are getting a return on our research dollars. The other 96 percent is spent on research, going out mainly to university research: Yet, it is that agency that the proposal that is before us tonight would do substantial damage to. The

gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] seeks to minimize the amount of that damage, not really to extend and advance significantly the fine work of the National Science Foundation, but at least to mitigate the damage.

A second example is with reference to the environment. Now, I know that the real monument of this Gingrich Congress has been its attempt to cut Medicare. But ranking right up there with the effort to cut Medicare surely is the effort to aid every polluter in the country with reference to the environment.

Mr. Chairman, we remember last year the enactment in this House of the Dirty Water Act that would end 20 years of the national cleanup of pollution of our streams and lakes and rivers, a proposal that the New York Times succinctly described as one that would make it easier for polluters to pollute; but that is no surprise because polluters wrote the bill.

□ 1815

Then all of last fall we had all these antienvironmental riders that would get tacked on without a hearing that would propose to hamstring first one Federal agency after another in protecting the public health and safety with reference to our environment, and we have had one thing after another, and this year the only thing different was some memo that came out from the Republican House conference that suggested Republican Members go out and hug trees and go to zoos and pet animals to indicate they really were not as antienvironmental as appeared to be the case.

And so now we come to the science budget, and the continuation of this extremist agenda is to simply say that certain types of research will be off limits. We do not want to know what the good science will show with reference to these areas, we want to prohibit research altogether.

For example, long-term climate change research at one Federal agency, indoor air research at another agency, and cut renewable energy research by 50 percent, some restricted, some significantly reduced, and I suppose that that is consistent with the comment of one of the House Republican leaders that a scientist, a distinguished chemist who got an award, the Nobel Prize, for his work in chemistry in discovering the link between chlorofluorocarbons and ozone depletion in our atmosphere, he was referred to as having received the Noble appeasement award.

It is that kind of extremist endeavor that is carried on in this bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] proposes to ameliorate, and I heartily support his effort to do that.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

One of the serious problems with H.R. 3322 is the omission of research

conducted by the Department of Energy. This substitute restores funding for these programs. We made tremendous progress and received Noble prizes for the research conducted in labs funded under research programs by the Department of Energy. The Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Virginia is the Department of Energy facility that supports a national subatomic particle research. This facility provides the Nation a unique tool for exploring the structure of the nucleus of an atom and for dramatically increasing our understanding of how the basic building blocks of nature work. The Transfer Technology Program funded by the Department of Energy includes the very best scientific research facilities in the Nation. Under the guidance of the Laser Processing Consortium, which includes 22 laboratories and universities on three continents, we have developed cutting-edge technologies that will be critical in our future health and national economic well-being. As a nation we must retain our edge to meet the coming international competition.

Another program, Mr. Chairman, funded under this substitute is the Mission to Planet Earth project under NASA. Two satellites not funded under the base bill are essential to determining how climate changes. Not the impact of weather changes; we know how floods and tornados and droughts and snow affect our climates, but we need the information that will be collected by CHEM-1 and P.M.-1 satellites which will help to establish early warning systems, provide information on natural irrigation channels and assist in recognizing the power of wind, water, and natural vegetation on our home planet.

I am also pleased to see the restoration in the substitute of the 20-percent funding cut in H.R. 3322 of the NASA advanced subsonic program. This funding is vitally important to maintaining this Nation's longstanding leadership on subsonic research. We need the studies on aging aircraft used in the newer economy airlines, we need the improvement of safety of our air traffic control systems, and we need the research and development of the quieter, more fuel efficient and environmentally safe aircraft.

I acknowledge and support the need to cut Government spending where appropriate in order to meet our budget responsibilities, but such a cut to NASA's aeronautics program are extremely counterproductive to our shared goals of creating a stronger economy and a stronger America.

I ask that we support the Brown substitute.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Science, I rise today in strong support of the Brown substitute and against H.R. 3322.

Over the shoulders of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] in the

Committee on Science hearing room is a biblical quotation which reads, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." In my view, H.R. 3322 is a bill without vision. Because of its short-sighted cuts to civilian R&D our Nation's leadership position on science and technology issues may very well perish in the not too distant future.

The Brown substitute offers a much different vision of the Federal Government's role in research and development. It represents a vision that Government can and should be a partner with industry as we move into the 21st century. Its enactment is critical for our future.

A key difference between the Brown substitute and H.R. 3322 is the treatment of NASA's Mission to Planet Earth. This important program will provide us with a better scientific understanding of global change and directly stimulate American interests around the globe.

As an example, Mission to Planet Earth-generated data will help scientists answer key questions about our planet's changing climate and will help farmers understand and predict El Nino positions, allowing them to plant their crops accordingly.

Unlike the Brown substitute, which funds Mission to Planet Earth at the administration's requested level, H.R. 3322 dramatically slashes the program by \$374 million in fiscal year 1997. This cut flies counter to the National Research Council's comprehensive review of the program, a review requested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] himself.

The review was clear, the science underlying the Mission to Planet Earth Program is fundamentally sound. The PM-1 and CHEM-1 mission should be implemented without delay. Dr. Ed Frieman, who chaired the study, testified before the Committee on Science that postponing PM and CHEM would not only cause delay, but also would increase costs.

At a March Committee on Science hearing on global climate change in the Mission to Planet Earth Program, not a single witness advocated canceling the PM and CHEM mission. No one urged the committee to chop \$374 million from the program. Even renowned global warming skeptics agreed that more data on climate change was a necessity.

Mr. Chairman, we need to be doing more, not less research into difficult scientific questions like climate change. Good science is good business. We must be visionary, not reactionary. I urge Members to support the Brown substitute, a strong vision for our Nation's science and technology future.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] for her words about restoring the funding to the NASA personnel account. That was a cut that should not have

been made, and, as I think we noted when we marked up H.R. 3322 at full committee, these personnel funding cuts would cause a very severe hardship on the very hard-working men and women at NASA centers, something that was confirmed in writing by the NASA comptroller some time ago.

I certainly rise in support of the Brown substitute and particularly the provisions relating to the NASA administration. As I mentioned in the general debate, while H.R. 3322 maintains full funding for the space station and biomedical research; I am grateful for that; I like that part of it; I have been troubled by some of the other cuts to NASA though in the bill, and I am pleased that the Brown substitute would correct these problems.

First, the substitute funds NASA at the level of the President's request, \$13.8 billion. It is a reasonable funding level, maintaining our commitment to NASA's programs and its dedicated personnel while at the same time continuing our commitment to deficit reduction. It is not a budget buster, and in fact the level of NASA funding contained in the Brown substitute and in the President's request is almost \$100 million below the fiscal year 1996 appropriation for NASA.

Second, the Brown substitute fully funds the space station as well as the biomedical research that I believe will develop and develop into very important benefits to all of our citizens, young and old.

So I am pleased that NASA and the National Institutes of Health are working together effectively on a wide range of cooperative research activities, and the Brown substitute will allow that significant research to continue.

Third, the Brown substitute will restore funding that was cut from a number of critical accounts. In addition to the funding for Mission to Planet Earth, which I am sure other Members have addressed or will address, the Brown substitute restores funding for the Advanced Subsonic Aeronautical Research Program. The funding will allow NASA to continue several things, among them research to address safety concerns relating to aging aircraft, collaborative initiatives with the Federal Aviation Administration to improve the safety and efficiency of the Nation's air traffic management system, R&D to develop the technologies for quieter, more fuel efficient aircraft, R&D for general aviation commuter aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, the Brown substitute also restores the funding that was cut from NASA's personnel account, and I have addressed that, and it was very well addressed, and the NASA comptroller had already stated that the proposed cuts to the salaries and expense accounts would result in furloughs at the NASA centers, something that I believe no Member of Congress wants to impose on the hard-working employees of the space agency.



Further, the Brown substitute restores the funding for facilities and maintenance facilities at the center. That is very important. The one-third cut to the maintenance budget contained in H.R. 3322 would hurt the ability of the centers to carry out their missions in a safe and timely manner. So we should not really be making cuts that lead to higher costs down the road, as is usually the case when we cut the deferred maintenance.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, the Brown substitute maintains our historic support of the U.S. space program and provides the responsible level of funding for NASA and its activities. I urge my colleagues to support the Brown amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for offering his substitute, and I also wish to thank the approximately 16 or so Members from the minority who have spoken in favor of it and given all the details of why the substitute is so much better than the original bill.

The original bill that is before us, Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, is one of the worst bills that I have ever seen; is the worst, not one, is the worst that I have ever seen come out of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in my 20 years here.

I had served under, on the Committee on Science, under illustrious chairmen such as Don Fuqua and Bob Rowe and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN]. I now serve under the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The distinct difference between those and the one I presently have is that they were interested in promoting science in this country. They were interested in basic research in this country. They were not interested in getting rid of programs that benefit this country in the name of balancing the budget when it is really in the name: I do not like the programs, I am not in favor of the programs, therefore we are going to get rid of them no matter how good they are for the country.

□ 1830

What does this all relate to? It all really gets back to a philosophy, and a philosophy of government, and the difference between the majority, led by the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the radical Republican extremists, that want to remove the Federal Government from all sectors of society and say let the free market take care of it.

If we had done that in the past, we would not have all of the benefits that this country presently has, especially from basic research that we will find from NSF. We would not have the development of the small businesses and large businesses throughout this country, and our ability to be in the forefront in the economic sector of this

world, because it is that partnership that was spoken of earlier between government, industry, and individuals that has made this country great.

Yet, the radical right of the majority would like to tell us that the role of the Federal Government is just to defend our shores and that is it, and get out of the way of everybody else. That is what they say. If we stop and think about that, it is a little bit scary, folks. It scares me that the Federal Government should only defend the shores and not have anything else to do with the rest of mankind in this country.

Our Constitution not only provides for defending the shores, but also says that the Federal Government must care for the general welfare of the people. That is basically what some of us are about. That is the basic difference. And when Members look at this bill that we have before us, the unnecessary cuts, because we do not need them, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] pointed out; under the coalition budget we reached a balanced budget in the same time period that the Republicans did, and yet we even cut more spending in that timeframe. Our deficits are smaller, the debt is less in 2002, and yet we could take the Brown substitute and fit it in and provide the basic research, the partnership programs with business and industry and small businesses. We can do all of that.

So this is a clear case not of doing it to balance the budget, but it is a clear case of reducing NSF funding, reducing basic research into energy supplies solely for the purpose of getting rid of it because we do not like it. The Republicans will tell you they do not believe in these programs. I daresay that if we would have been down this road when I first was here 20 years ago, we would not have many of the benefits that we have today, that we in this country enjoy today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOLKMER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there are very many scientists in this country who do the research, that does benefit everybody in this country, who feel that we should do away with basic research programs. I maintain that there are people out there that are dedicated scientists willing to take on the task of trying to find knowledge for the sake of knowledge, so that knowledge, once it proves out, can lead to such things as getting rid of many diseases that we presently have, many illnesses that we presently have; getting us a new way to manufacture products, new materials for products.

I can remember back when I was a youngster, and things have changed dramatically up to the present time. A lot of that is because of research that

was done on behalf of the Federal Government, and in cooperation with university professors and scientists, industrial scientists. It is that basic research that has gotten us where we are.

Now to say that we no longer need to do these things to the extent that the gentleman from California, Mr. BROWN, has provided in the substitute tells me very clearly that the majority, under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, clearly is on the road to eliminating these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the substitute offered by the gentleman from California, and I commend him for offering it. I strongly oppose the bill as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill H.R. 3322 and in support of the Brown substitute. This bill seeks to create the impression that we are considering an omnibus civilian science proposal, but we are not. Noticeably absent are the energy research and development [R&D] programs at the Department of Energy [DOE]. How do we explain the absence of about \$4.7 billion in authorizations for the civilian science programs at DOE?

Federal support for R&D is the quintessential investment in our Nation's future. Unfortunately, despite 5 years of strong bipartisan support, the Republican leadership now treats R&D as a low priority. The overall reduction would be \$711 million below this year's funding and nearly \$800 million below the President's proposal. Solar and renewable energy research would be cut 34 percent. Conservation energy R&D would be slashed 43 percent. Fuel cell research would be cut 66 percent. And I would remind my colleagues that this is all being done in one year, not over 5 years or 7 years.

We cannot let stand congressional proposals that endanger our ability to create more high-income jobs in developing industries as well as to promote safer, more cost-efficient and environmentally sensitive energy technologies.

R&D is responsible for approximately one-half of the productivity improvements in the Nation's economy. Technological innovation is the single most important source of long-term economic growth, and the total economic return on investment in R&D is several times as high as for other forms of investment.

While Republicans seek to make political hay out of the gas price spike we are currently suffering, they are cutting the research at DOE that moves us away from dependence upon gasoline. While Senator DOLE proposes a cut in the gas tax, House Republicans propose a cut DOE's transportation energy Research budget by \$66.8 million below this year's funding, a 38 percent cut.

We don't know when or if the Republicans will make good on these threats to cut DOE. For the sake of my home State of California, I hope they do not. The Department of Energy calculated that California received about \$722 million in energy R&D funding in fiscal year 1995. We are heavily involved in programs like energy conservation research, and research on fusion energy development, both of which are hit heavily in the Republican proposals. I mentioned fuel cell research as an

area being targeted and as one that is important to a State seeking to sustain our economic recovery while maintaining our air quality. In the Third District, we have the University of California at Davis, which ranks in the top 20 universities in Federal research grants and is responsible for managing three DOE laboratories. All of these programs are at risk if the Republican committee proposal prevails.

The substitute offered by Mr. BROWN today contains all of the programs that should be in an omnibus bill, including the DOE programs. And it funds them at the President's request level. If you are concerned, as I am, about our energy future you will support Mr. BROWN. If you want energy security in the future, as I know the residents of my State do, you will support the Brown substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, further proceedings on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 14, offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] and amendment No. 8, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 243, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—170

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Bentsen
Ackerman	Barcia	Berman
Andrews	Becerra	Bevill
Baesler	Beilenson	Bishop

Bonior	Harman
Borski	Hastings (FL)
Boucher	Hefner
Brewster	Hilliard
Browder	Hinchey
Brown (CA)	Holden
Brown (FL)	Hoyer
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)
Bryant (TX)	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Cardin	Jefferson
Clay	Johnson (SD)
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.
Clement	Johnston
Clyburn	Kanjorski
Coleman	Kaptur
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)
Coyne	Kennelly
Cramer	Kildee
Cummings	Klink
Danner	LaFalce
DeFazio	Levin
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)
Dellums	Lipinski
Deutsch	Lofgren
Dicks	Luther
Dixon	Maloney
Doggett	Manton
Dooley	Markey
Doyle	Martinez
Durbin	Mascara
Edwards	Matsui
Engel	McDermott
Eshoo	McHale
Evans	McKinney
Farr	McNulty
Fattah	Meehan
Fazio	Meek
Fields (LA)	Menendez
Filner	Millender
Flake	McDonald
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)
Frost	Minge
Furse	Mink
Gejdenson	Moakley
Gephardt	Mollohan
Gibbons	Montgomery
Gonzalez	Moran
Gordon	Murtha
Green (TX)	Gutierrez
Gutierrez	Hall (OH)
Hall (OH)	Hall (TX)
Hall (TX)	Hamilton
Hamilton	

#### NOES—243

Allard	Coburn	Gekas
Archer	Collins (GA)	Geren
Armey	Combest	Gilchrest
Bachus	Condit	Gillmor
Baker (CA)	Cooley	Gilman
Baker (LA)	Costello	Goodlatte
Ballenger	Cox	Goodling
Barr	Crane	Goss
Barrett (NE)	Crapo	Graham
Barrett (WI)	Creameans	Greene (UT)
Bartlett	Cubin	Greenwood
Barton	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Bass	Davis	Hancock
Bateman	Deal	Hansen
Bereuter	DeLay	Hastert
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Dickey	Hayworth
Bliley	Doolittle	Hefley
Blute	Dornan	Heineman
Boehlert	Dreier	Heger
Boehner	Duncan	Hilleary
Bonilla	Dunn	Hobson
Bono	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Brownback	Ehrlich	Hoke
Bryant (TN)	Emerson	Horn
Bunn	English	Hostettler
Bunning	Ensign	Houghton
Burr	Everett	Hunter
Burton	Ewing	Hutchinson
Buyer	Fawell	Hyde
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Inglis
Calvert	Flanagan	Istook
Camp	Foley	Jacobs
Campbell	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Fox	Jones
Chabot	Franks (CT)	Kasich
Chambliss	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Chenoweth	Frelinghuysen	Kim
Christensen	Frisa	King
Chrysler	Funderburk	Kingston
Clinger	Galleghy	Klecza
Coble	Ganske	Klug

Knollenberg	Nussle	Shuster
Kolbe	Obey	Sisisky
LaHood	Oxley	Skeen
Largent	Packard	Smith (MI)
Latham	Parker	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Paxon	Smith (TX)
Laughlin	Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)
Lazio	Petri	Souder
Leach	Pickett	Spence
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Stearns
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Stockman
Lightfoot	Portman	Stump
Linder	Poshard	Talent
Livingston	Pryce	Tate
LoBiondo	Quillen	Tauzin
Longley	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
Lucas	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Manzullo	Ramstad	Thomas
Martini	Regula	Thornberry
McCarthy	Riggs	Tiahrt
McCollum	Roberts	Torkildsen
McCrery	Rogers	Upton
McDade	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
McInnis	Ros-Lehtinen	Walker
McIntosh	Roth	Walsh
McKeon	Royce	Wamp
Metcalf	Sabo	Watts (OK)
Meyers	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
Mica	Sanford	Weldon (PA)
Miller (FL)	Saxton	Weller
Moorhead	Scarborough	White
Morella	Schaefer	Whitfield
Myers	Schiff	Wicker
Myrick	Seastrand	Wise
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Neumann	Shadeegg	Young (AK)
Ney	Shaw	Zeliff
Norwood	Shays	Zimmer

#### NOT VOTING—20

Chapman	Hayes	Pomeroy
Conyers	Lantos	Roukema
de la Garza	Lincoln	Solomon
Dingell	Lowe	Studds
Foglietta	McHugh	Torricelli
Ford	Molinari	Young (FL)
Gunderson	Peterson (FL)	

□ 1855

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Young of Florida against.

Mr. CLINGER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. STOKES, BENTSEN, and MONTGOMERY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 235, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—176

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Ackerman	Gordon	Olver
Andrews	Green (TX)	Ortiz
Baesler	Gutierrez	Orton
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Owens
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Becerra	Hamilton	Pastor
Beilenson	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Berman	Hefner	Pelosi
Bevill	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Hinchey	Pickett
Bonior	Holden	Rahall
Borski	Houghton	Rangel
Boucher	Hoyer	Reed
Brewster	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Browder	Jackson-Lee	Rivers
Brown (CA)	(TX)	Rose
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rush
Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Cardin	Johnston	Sawyer
Chapman	Kanjorski	Schroeder
Clay	Kaptur	Schumer
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Scott
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Serrano
Clyburn	Kennelly	Sisisky
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Skaggs
Collins (MI)	Klink	Skelton
Condit	LaFalce	Slaughter
Coyne	Levin	Spratt
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Cummings	Lofgren	Stenholm
Danner	Luther	Stokes
DeLauro	Maloney	Stupak
Dellums	Manton	Tanner
Deutsch	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Martinez	Tejeda
Dixon	Mascara	Thompson
Doggett	Matsui	Thornton
Dooley	McCarthy	Thurman
Doyle	McDermott	Torres
Durbin	McHale	Towns
Edwards	McKinney	Trafigant
Engel	McNulty	Velazquez
Eshoo	Meehan	Vento
Evans	Meek	Visclosky
Farr	Menendez	Volkmer
Fattah	Millender	Ward
Fazio	McDonald	Waters
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Filner	Minge	Waxman
Flake	Mink	Williams
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Wilson
Frost	Mollohan	Wise
Furse	Montgomery	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Moran	Wynn
Gephardt	Murtha	Yates
Geren	Nadler	
Gibbons	Neal	

NOES—235

Allard	Castle	Everett
Archer	Chabot	Ewing
Armey	Chambliss	Fawell
Bachus	Christensen	Fields (TX)
Baker (CA)	Chrysler	Flanagan
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Foley
Ballenger	Coble	Forbes
Barr	Coburn	Fowler
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)	Fox
Barrett (WI)	Combest	Franks (CT)
Bartlett	Cooley	Franks (NJ)
Barton	Costello	Frelinghuysen
Bass	Cox	Frisa
Bateman	Crane	Funderburk
Bereuter	Crapo	Gallely
Bilirakis	Cremeans	Ganske
Bliley	Cubin	Gekas
Blute	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Boehlert	Davis	Gillmor
Boehner	Deal	Gilman
Bonilla	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Bono	DeLay	Goodling
Brownback	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Bryant (TN)	Dickey	Graham
Bunn	Doolittle	Greene (UT)
Bunning	Dornan	Greenwood
Burr	Dreier	Gutknecht
Burton	Duncan	Hancock
Buyer	Dunn	Hansen
Callahan	Ehlers	Hastert
Calvert	Ehrlich	Hastings (WA)
Camp	Emerson	Hayworth
Campbell	English	Hefley
Canady	Ensign	Heineman

Herger	McInnis	Schaefer
Hilleary	McIntosh	Schiff
Hobson	McKeon	Seastrand
Hoekstra	Metcalf	Sensenbrenner
Hoke	Meyers	Shadegg
Horn	Mica	Shaw
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Shays
Hunter	Moorhead	Shuster
Hutchinson	Morella	Skeen
Hyde	Myers	Smith (MI)
Inglis	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Istook	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Jacobs	Neumann	Smith (WA)
Johnson (CT)	Ney	Solomon
Johnson, Sam	Norwood	Souder
Jones	Nussle	Spence
Kasich	Obey	Stearns
Kelly	Oxley	Stockman
Kim	Packard	Stump
King	Parker	Talent
Kingston	Paxon	Tate
Klecza	Petri	Tauzin
Klug	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
Knollenberg	Porter	Thomas
Kolbe	Portman	Thornberry
LaHood	Poshard	Tiahrt
Latham	Pryce	Torkildsen
LaTourette	Quillen	Upton
Laughlin	Quinn	Vucanovich
Lazio	Radanovich	Walker
Leach	Ramstad	Walsh
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Riggs	Watts (OK)
Lightfoot	Roberts	Weldon (FL)
Linder	Roemer	Weldon (PA)
Lipinski	Rogers	Weller
Livingston	Rohrabacher	White
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Longley	Roth	Wicker
Lucas	Royce	Wolf
Manzullo	Salmon	Young (AK)
Martini	Sanders	Zeliff
McCollum	Sanford	Zimmer
McCrery	Saxton	
McDade	Scarborough	

NOT VOTING—22

Bilbray	Gunderson	Peterson (FL)
Chenoweth	Hayes	Pomeroy
Coleman	Lantos	Roukema
Conyers	Largent	Studds
de la Garza	Lincoln	Torricelli
Dingell	Lowe	Young (FL)
Foglietta	McHugh	
Ford	Molinari	

□ 1902

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Young of Florida against.

Mr. FORBES changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WALKER Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 3322, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### REPORT ON A HOUSE RESOLUTION ON PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOHN M. QUINN, DAVID WATKINS, AND MATTHEW MOORE

Mr. CLINGER, from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight,

submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-598) on a House resolution on proceedings against John M. Quinn, David Watkins, and Matthew Moore, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 427 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3322.

□ 1905

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3322, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 8, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] had been disposed of.

Are there further amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

#### TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

##### SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1996".

##### SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Foundation;

(2) the term "Foundation" means the National Science Foundation;

(3) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965;

(4) the term "national research facility" means a research facility funded by the Foundation which is available, subject to appropriate policies allocating access, for use by all scientists and engineers affiliated with research institutions located in the United States; and

(5) the term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

#### Subtitle A—National Science Foundation Authorization

##### SEC. 111. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the programs of the Foundation are important for the Nation to strengthen basic research and develop human resources in science and engineering, and that those programs should be funded at an adequate level;

(2) the primary mission of the Foundation continues to be the support of basic scientific research and science education and